The Forum

JANUARY, 1896.

SOME SUGGESTIONS ON CURRENCY AND BANKING.

THE discussions on the silver and currency questions during the last few years show how easy it is to confound *money* and *values*, the *coin unit* and *currency*. In the earliest periods of human civilization there was no money and yet there were values. They were expressed by different units, such as cattle, etc. Advancing civilization evolved a unit more stable and more generally acceptable,—a certain quantity (by weight) of the precious metals, varying at different times and at different places. Later on this unit was stamped into convenient shape, and the community or individual doing this stamping (coining) was supposed to guarantee the correctness of the weight. Names were given to these coins, which were generalized as money, and it became customary to express values by these names instead of by weight. This, however, did not change the unit, although many are deceived into considering the name more important than the quantity or quality of metal, and imagine that it is sufficient to *name alike quantities or qualities that are different*, to make them *alike valuable* as units. Good men and bad men, kings and beggars, have been so deceived, or have in various ways tried to deceive others; but the inexorable natural laws of barter and trade, supply and demand, have always forced a return to the original basis, and all temporary advantages resulting from unnatural interference with these units have been followed by disaster in proportion to the extent of the offence.

In olden times, when each little town was a financial centre of its own, on account of the difficulty of communication even with neighbor-

Copyright, 1895, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing centres,—each centre having to produce everything it required, or go without,—these units were numerous and restricted to their respective localities. Trade eventually began in the shape of exchange of merchandise between centres; the smaller localities gradually uniting and forming larger ones, and adopting a common unit (or money). Railroads, steamships, and telegraphs have created trading and financial centres for whole countries, and this evolution is still continuing. Hence to-day our units are very few, and eventually there will be only one. Experiments, therefore, which would have been harmless a hundred years ago, as they would have affected only isolated localities, are fatal to-day because they affect the prosperity of whole countries.

In this process of evolution banks were established in which coin was deposited to be drawn against by checks, so that actual coin is used to a very small extent in modern trade. This system has grown to such an extent that bank balances are considered in trade as good as coin, and, so long as they are so considered, evolution will allow this substitute for coin to be steadily increased. Hence anything that can be exchanged for such a bank balance has a value equal to coin, and bank balances are commonly called money, the same as coin. It follows, therefore, that bank-balance money can be increased to a large extent, if confidence that it can be exchanged for coin remains undisturbed; for nobody wants the coin so long as he knows or believes he can get it.

The assertion is often made that an increase of coin (money) will increase values; but as the actual amount of coin in the whole world, compared to the sum total of all values, is extremely small,—probably in a proportion of not more than one of coin to 100,000 of values,—this assertion is evidently absurd, because at best it could be only an infinitesimal addition to coin in comparison with values. As a matter of fact only an increased amount of confidence will increase values. Increase of coin or money *may* increase confidence and thereby increase values; but it *may* be of such a nature as to decrease confidence, and under such circumstances it would decrease values. Confidence nowadays has to be universal and shared in by the whole world, which is practically one great commercial centre, and as all values depend on their exchangeability for coin, or rather upon the confidence in their being so exchangeable, it should be the policy of good financial laws to establish all possible safeguards against disturbance of that confidence as well as to prevent dangerous over-confidence.

First of all we should have a stable unit. The unit now existing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this country is the gold dollar. Bank notes, greenbacks, silver coin, and silver certificates may circulate alongside of it only so long as the confidence remains that, whenever their holders please, they may exchange them for this unit on the basis of their face value. An increase of any form of money to a point where this exchangeability becomes doubtful destroys confidence, and therefore leads, not to an increase, but to a contraction of money. Many suggestions made to increase wealth, such as free coinage of silver, unlimited printing of greenbacks, issuance of paper money against real estate and farm products,—in fact all those suggestions that can be summarized as "the cry for more money" without regard to its soundness (that is, its exchangeability for the gold unit) would, if carried out, destroy confidence and therefore decrease wealth and impede the development and prosperity of the country.

The next important step is the centralization of our banking system so as to increase our bank-balance money, make it elastic according to the requirements of commerce, and thus act as a financial regulator and safety-valve to modify or prevent the frequent and violent fluctuations to which we are now subject. This centralization, I think, can best be brought about by careful development of our clearing-house system, in such a manner that the now disconnected banks of this country shall mutually unite for certain purposes and eventually form a National Clearing-House Bank, which would act for this country somewhat in the same manner as the great central banks of England, France, and Germany.

This development should not be imperilled by prejudices arising from the history of the former United States Bank, which was organized on a different principle, and which could not be revived to-day in this country on account of its general incompatibility with our institutions. The clearing-house is not a bank in any such sense, and a centralization produced by a combination of clearing-houses is not in any manner subject to the abuses to which such a central bank might be subject under our method of government. On the contrary the centralization by means of clearing-house banks would be in thorough harmony with American institutions, and would give us all the benefits of a great central bank without any of its dangers.

I may mention the fact that independent banks have now to rely on their own resources alone, and therefore cannot always give accommodation to their customers to the extent that they would like to do. This is especially the case when clouds appear on the financial horizon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In such periods—the very times when they should be able to expand—they are forced to contract, and disaster is the result. The smaller customers suffer much more from this than the richer ones, and the speculator has great advantages over the manufacturer and merchant, because the speculator has collaterals to offer that can be sold quickly; whereas a stock of merchandise, or outstanding accounts, or goods in course of manufacture, may have to be carried and nursed along. This latter risk banks cannot at such seasons afford to take, and for this reason merchants and manufacturers have to pay much higher rates for money than speculators, and often cannot get it at all. This should not be, and would not be if the banks had the backing of a central institution. Such centralization, therefore, far from being in the interest of rich and powerful concerns and speculators, would first of all help the merchants and manufacturers, whose reasonable requirements for legitimate purposes should always be supplied at reasonable rates. The extraordinary stability of commerce and industry in France—even at the time of the Panama collapse—is entirely due to the Bank of France and its wise management. The ultimate benefits of proper centralization are so far-reaching that I do not dare mention any more, for fear of being called visionary.

The issuance of clearing-house certificates in New York, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia, by moderating the recent panic, prevented a general financial collapse; and it has certainly demonstrated the benefit of joint action. Why not, therefore, legalize what is acknowledged to be a necessity for the public good, and extend the system until every bank in the country is a member of such a clearing-house combination, and by such union give the individual bank the strength —which it now lacks—safely to supply the money needed by trade for legitimate purposes. This would produce "more money," *more* and *safer* than any of the other "more money" prescriptions. It would be the ideal "elastic currency." It would even to a large extent operate as a natural anti-trust law, for it would give comparatively greater facilities to the merchant and manufacturer for legitimate requirements than to speculative individuals and corporations. It would materially help in solving all other financial questions, and would deprive the "gold shipment" bugaboo of many of its terrors. Briefly, my idea is about as follows:—

Let banks of any kind, in every city or small district, combine in the formation of a kind of Clearing-House Bank, to whose regulations and inspection they would be subject, in addition to State or national laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Allow such clearing-house banks to perform all the functions now assumed by the clearing-houses, and gradually to extend the same by acting as depositaries for bank reserves, etc., opening regular accounts and loaning its funds, *but doing business only with its members.*

Let the directors of such clearing-house banks be elected in such a way that only a few are changed every year,—such election to be determined by the votes of the members according to the average amount of their deposits in the year past, and *let the members be responsible for their clearing-house bank in the same proportion as their vote for directors.*

Let these city or district clearing-house banks combine on the same conditions and for the same purpose in a State Clearing-House Bank, and eventually these State clearing-house banks could form a National Clearing-House Bank. When this is accomplished, we would have a central institution of finance, *dealing with its members only*, which would represent all the banks of the country, *and be guaranteed by them*, and to it should be ultimately delegated all power to issue currency. It would be the great central reservoir, from which, indirectly, every little bank in the United States would derive its strength to supply its customers with bank-balance money and currency; and it would by judicious management give confidence and a stability to commerce not hitherto experienced in this country.

I lay great stress on not allowing any of the clearing-house banks to do business with any one except its members; but ultimately the National Clearing-House Bank should be given limited power to act as a bank of deposit for the Government, and to deal in gold to such an extent as may be necessary to preserve general confidence. Some national legislation may be needed to carry out this idea, but a very substantial and beneficial beginning could be made without it.

Future historians will refer to the last decades of the nineteenth century to show how Americans—so great in many other respects—chased financial rainbows and unsuccessfully tried all kinds of remedies for fancied and real ills before they entrusted their finances to properly trained men, as they had previously found it expedient to do with their army and navy, their health departments, their courts of justice, their colleges, etc. Finance is not yet accepted as a science by us, probably because our country is so rich that so far it has been able to stand unscientific experiments that would have ruined almost any other nation. The Germans, who have been forced by necessity to husband their resources, have made enormous strides since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their finances have been managed by a great central institution—the Reichsbank—under the leadership of the best talent. France and England have long been envied for the comparative stability and safety of their finances, which is due to the workings of their great central banks. We can yet outdo them all, if only we apply the same common sense to our finances that we apply to other departments.

Ours is the richest country in the world. We should be and can be the most powerful nation financially and every other way; but, to accomplish this, we must dispel all doubt as to our financial unit, we must centralize our banking system, and we must manage our finances on scientific principles.

ADOLF LADENBURG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RAILROAD-RATE WARS: THEIR CAUSE AND CURE.

NOTWITHSTANDING the distrust with which railroads and their operations are commonly regarded, no work of man compels more unceasing admiration than do the achievements of the locomotive. Marvellous to contemplate is the industrial revolution which followed its invention. Forces not before dreamed of were set in motion, and an era of development resulted which in the ensuing fifty years surpassed, in its beneficent influences, the progress of preceding centuries. And yet this harbinger of hope and prosperity to the world at large has by no means proven an unfailing blessing. Indeed, in many instances and in various ways, it has shown its power to injure and oppress. Some of the causes which produced those unlooked-for effects will herein be stated.

In old days the stage-coach and the sailing-vessel offered the quickest mode of travel and transportation. Heavy articles could be carried only short distances over land; and as passable roads were few, the pack-mule was the medium when rugged mountains, unbroken plains, or unsettled valleys had to be crossed. The immediate success of the locomotive at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester railroad admitted of no competition. Charters for the construction of railroads throughout Great Britain were granted in quick succession, followed by similar action on the Continent and in America. Stock companies innumerable were formed; and, with an eagerness that invited disaster, deluded people contributed to any scheme which its promoters predicted would enrich investors. Often since then, in the haste to become rich, history, in this respect, has repeated itself; and, notwithstanding the widespread ruin which has invariably resulted, the required lesson is seldom learned except by sad experience.

As indicating how little the railway was at first understood, it may be said that the original expectation was that all persons who desired to run their wagons thereon would be at liberty to do so on payment of specified tolls. Railroads were thus to be improvements upon the highways only in the opportunity to lease a superior motive power. Quickly such conception was shown to be impracticable. There has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been no operating skill sufficient to facilitate the movement, on one track and at the same time, of cars severally directed. Casualties occur now with too sad frequency—through negligence or from causes beyond control—without permitting whomsoever may wish, to run their vehicles upon a railroad as they would upon a highway. Necessarily the service had to be performed by one company in each instance; while the saving in time and expense in the movement of goods, together with greater comfort and convenience assured to the traveller, gave to the locomotive a monopoly of long-distance land transportation.

The foregoing statements, although trite, are essential to an appreciation of the conditions out of which have grown evils which the public has never ceased to condemn. I have explained that the assumption of equal facilities, through the running of private equipment on the payment of a uniform system of tolls, was a mistaken one; and that the superior service rendered by the locomotive excluded inferior competition. The concentration of authority, and the extinction of rivalry by other modes, opened the way for inequalities of which many who felt aggrieved have loudly complained.

If railroads had been operated as public highways, upon which any persons could run their wagons, then the rentals therefor would have been prescribed, as at toll-gates, for each class of vehicles. But the fact that the companies monopolized the service led them to acquire for their directors, in their charters, the right to prescribe reasonable rates for the transportation of persons and property. The authority thus conveyed was an agreeable fiction, which, however proper in its early recognition, has no place in modern practice, and has not had for many years. The idea that the directors of railroad companies would calmly adjust the constantly varying schedules of fares and freight may have occurred to the original promoters of those enterprises as entirely practicable, but it has not proved so to their successors. They seldom meet oftener than quarterly, and then concern themselves chiefly with a review of the financial condition of the properties. And yet that depends mainly upon the maintenance of remunerative charges for the services performed. But I will refer to that point farther on, and will now describe the manner in which rates have usually been made, and the baneful effects that have not infrequently followed.

Complaints as to extortion and unjust discrimination were not made until many years after railroads had been in operation. People are usually so gratified with the advent of a railroad, and the ability to communicate with the outer world, that they only contrast their im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proved condition with their former isolation and the cost and delay of teaming. Initial operations were (and still are) comparatively simple. Schedules are made, naming rates of fare or freight, graded according to distance. These are so much below the charges for transportation under primitive methods that they are quite satisfactory; and complaint is seldom heard until comparison is made with localities that are favored with two or more railroads. At such points there is competition, and, as distance is usually taken into account in fixing the schedule that shall govern, the short line determines the rate. Necessarily the long line has to meet the prices of its shorter rival or retire from the field. Frequently a strife ensues, during which the charges drop to unprofitable figures; but even then it is hard for the ordinary traffic agent to relinquish the business.

In former years railroad companies did not modify their tariffs at intermediate stations when they became involved in controversies at more distant points. That fact undoubtedly led to the construction of more railroads than were necessary to carry the limited amount of traffic offered. But those who were located at non-competitive points would observe passengers and freight carried past their doors at much lower rates than were exacted from them for a shorter distance: hence the cry for competition, resulting in the excessive construction which has proved disastrous in so many sections. Furthermore, the evil last referred to prompted the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce law, which forbids charging a greater sum for a shorter than for a longer distance in the same direction, the former being included within the latter. The effect of that clause—if it be strictly regarded—is to compel railroads to reduce their intermediate rates to the level upon which, by the force of land or water competition, they may be obliged to carry their more remote traffic. In theory the principle seems admirable, but in practice it is destructive.

It used to be said that no company could justify the collection of a larger sum for a shorter than for a longer distance. In defence of what has been thought impossible, familiar names will be used to make the proposition plain. Reno, Nevada, is one of the principal towns in that sparsely populated State. It is on the Central Pacific Railway—the pioneer route to the Pacific coast. At San Francisco, 306 miles beyond, there is severe competition with ships, which have a free course on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, in carrying transcontinental traffic. The railroads, in competition with the ocean, not infrequently have to make rates which, for the service across the continent, are un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasonably low. Should they, then, be held down to no greater charge from New York to Reno than their competition with the ocean may compel them to accept from New York to San Francisco? If a merchant at Reno patronizes the ocean or a rival railroad, neither can carry his goods farther than San Francisco, and he would still have to pay the charges of the Central Pacific Railway from the coast to Reno. Obviously, then, the latter company would be justified in charging, from the Atlantic seaboard to Reno direct, the regular rates from New York to San Francisco, plus the local rate thence to Reno; otherwise the railroad might elect to relinquish that traffic to the ocean or the northern routes, and the tariffs would then be constructed in manner as above stated. That proposition, when submitted to former members of the Interstate Commerce Commission — constituting a majority thereof—commended itself to their judgment as a safe rule to follow.

The most frequent complaints, however, arose in the Middle and Western States. Shippers at a station where there was but one railroad could not understand why, if there was a war of rates,—say from Chicago,—their freight should be charged the regular tariff to western destinations, while, if they were to ship to Chicago at the short local rates, they could obtain the "war" tariff, and the shipment would be forwarded through their town to its western destination at a total charge below what would be enforced if the goods had been shipped direct from the initial station. For example, a shipment from Aurora, Illinois, to Omaha, Nebraska, would be charged more than would a similar consignment from Chicago, through Aurora to Omaha, in case there were a war of rates between the several railroads extending from Chicago to Omaha. Apparently it did not occur to the Aurora dealer that if the road running through Aurora were to withdraw from the competition for the traffic between Chicago and Omaha, he would not benefit thereby; nor did he usually take into account the fact that the larger city could (and frequently did) furnish train-loads of freight, whereas the smaller place offered only occasional carloads; and when the trains were made up at the principal station, the addition of one carload (whether it came from Aurora or was received from a Chicago shipper in competition with other roads that were striving for it) made no appreciable difference in the expense, compared with that incurred at the way station, where special stops would have to be made to pick up the freight. The public either did not understand the circumstances, or they would not view them as they appeared to the carriers; hence the demand for the prohibition now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known as the "long-and-short-haul clause," which has been adopted in several States, so that it has become quite general in its application.

Another form of discrimination practised in years past was not susceptible of defence. In the English text-books it is termed "undue preference." It consisted of exceptional or special rates given to favored individuals, by means of which they were enabled to undersell their rivals in common markets. By such methods the fortunate few accumulated vast wealth, and men who subsequently posed as philanthropists obtained their start in trade through unfair advantages given them by railroad companies. Examples of surpassing interest could be cited, if it were consistent with confidences reposed to become reminiscent. The usual procedure was for the ambitious or less scrupulous to insist upon rebates that would enable them to outbid or undersell their competitors. In that way one firm grew until its grain shipments approximated 100,000 carloads per year. So closely were they enabled to figure, that a profit of one dollar per car was all they desired; and that was assured by the promised assistance of the interested carrier. The buyers for such a firm, being protected as described, would enter a western State and pay the prices necessary to secure the product. The practice led to the selection, by great systems of railroads, of dealers who were expected to handle the bulk of the produce grown along each line; and, to enable them to do so, facilities were extended which were denied to others. These preferences provoked violent complaints of unjust discrimination, and whenever the latter have been maintained, they have been severely condemned by the courts.

The evil extended to most departments of trade,—particularly such commodities as grain, coal, coke, oil, sugar, lumber, live-stock, meats, etc.,—until, in each, the favored ones became so powerful as to be able to compel exceptional recognition. Meanwhile those who had comparatively little tonnage to offer were required to pay the regular rates; and such discriminations—aggravated as they were, in some instances, beyond endurance—provoked the uprising (semi-revolutionary in character) known as the Granger movement. It was a protest against the arbitrary exercise of power in setting up one man and pulling down another, by the allowance of undue preferences in favor of the former. The popular impression was that, in certain instances, there was a division of profits between the grantors and the recipients of special rates; and such belief was not altogether erroneous.

Like every evil that is allowed to run until it becomes dangerous, the most prominent shippers eventually had the railroads at their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercy. Dealers in a staple commodity would ask that they be given 10, 15, or 20 per cent below the rates charged to others in the same business, or they would patronize competing carriers; and as their operations were enormous, they were certain to find those who could not resist such overtures. So notorious and obnoxious were the preferences which obtained throughout the land, that they compelled the adoption of the third section of the Interstate Commerce law, which forbids the charging of a greater sum to one person than to another, for a like service, under substantially similar circumstances. The correctness of that principle no fair-minded person will question; but unfortunately it is not strictly regarded, for reasons which, in this connection, need not be stated. The tendency of special rates to the favored few was to build up interests at terminal points. Thus, leading cities throughout the country strove to induce the respective railroad companies to champion their cause. The contests which ensued resulted in the establishment of differentials,—that is, agreed differences in the rates to one city as compared with those charged on the same commodity to a rival community.

In the domain of transportation no subject has provoked more bitter and costly conflicts than has the question of differentials. Probably the most famous are those which were waged on behalf of the seaboard cities. The practice was to agree upon the rates that should govern between New York and Chicago. Philadelphia would then take a somewhat lower scale, and Baltimore still less. For example, the rate on grain from Chicago to New York being fixed at 25 cents per 100 pounds, 90 per cent thereof governed to Philadelphia, and 87½ per cent to Baltimore. With such arrangements shippers at New York became dissatisfied, insisting that the supremacy of their city as an exporter would pass to Philadelphia or to Baltimore unless the first-named was accorded the same rates from the West as were enjoyed by the other two. That view they pressed so persistently upon Mr. Vanderbilt, of the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad, that he was induced to undertake to obtain for the metropolis the desired equality of rates with its rival cities. The contests which ensued cost the contending companies millions of dollars. Philadelphia's cause was championed by the Pennsylvania Railroad, while that of Baltimore was espoused by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. At the head of the former was Col. Thomas A. Scott—a wonderful organizer and remarkable executive officer; and in charge of the Baltimore & Ohio road was Mr. John W. Garrett—a man of unbending purpose and un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flinching loyalty to his own city. The conflicts, carried on for prolonged periods in different years, really accomplished nothing, excepting the waste of vast sums of money which might otherwise have been utilized in bettering the properties. The issues for which the leaders fought remained unsettled, and after the combatants had exhausted their energies they agreed, in January, 1882, to refer the question to Messrs. Allan G. Thurman, E. B. Washburne, and Thomas M. Cooley, to act as an Advisory Commission upon "the differences in rates that should exist, both eastwardly and westwardly, upon all classes of freight between the several terminal Atlantic ports." After an investigation extending over six months, the report confirmed the existing differentials, which, on grain, allowed Philadelphia 2 cents, and Baltimore 3 cents less than New York, on shipments from the West.

Of a similar character were the rivalries fiercely conducted in the early 'seventies, between Chicago and St. Louis, for the trade of what are commonly known as "Missouri River points." Those contests resulted in the establishment of differences which no one since has had the temerity to question. They were not based on distance, but were arbitrarily determined, beginning with 20 cents per 100 pounds on first-class freight and concluding with 5 cents on the lower or coarser qualities. That is to say, if the rate on first-class freight from St. Louis to Kansas City was 60 cents per 100 pounds, it would necessarily be made 80 cents from Chicago; and if a grain rate of 15 cents should be made from Omaha or Kansas City to the Mississippi River, 5 cents higher would be charged to Chicago.

Railroads, like individuals, are unequal; and the most frequent and violent disturbances have arisen from the inability of one company to obtain what it is pleased to regard as its "share" of competitive traffic on the same terms as its rival; whereupon the less-favored demand that their disability be recognized by the allowance of differentials; in other words, that they be permitted to charge less for a similar service than is exacted by better-located lines. The assertion of that principle led to anomalous contentions during the early contests between the trunk lines. One company had a longer route from the West than the New York Central railroad's distance from the same point to New York; while the mileage of the Pennsylvania road to Philadelphia, and of the Baltimore & Ohio line to Baltimore, were shorter than the route named to New York. Hence it evoked surprise when the longer route claimed the right to charge less than the New York Central Company's rate to New York, on account of greater length; while the roads to Philadel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phia and Baltimore insisted that they be permitted to make lower rates to their termini, because their mileage was shorter than that of the Central road to New York. Usually it is the longer route that asserts a disability which entitles it to charge less than its rival; and if the demand be not conceded, it is appropriated, with the certain result of a war in rates.

The entrance of a new railroad into a profitable territory almost invariably results in a disturbance of existing conditions. In no other way is it believed, by some roads, that they can so cheaply advertise their arrival and attract patrons. That object having been accomplished, and the influence of the new route acknowledged, an agreement embracing all parties is eventually made; but as there is no authority in law to enforce contracts of such nature, they are of brief duration. Even an approximate maintenance of agreed rates between American railroads, for a protracted period, is practically unknown. That is mainly because the device by which the desired result has been most nearly attained was removed when the fifth section of the Interstate Commerce law was adopted, and no available safeguard was substituted.

Prior to the passage of the non-pooling section, the method pursued to satisfy an inferior line was to ensure it an acceptable share of the competitive traffic, or an equivalent in money. This was upon the theory that a smaller percentage, at the full tariff, than the road could command on even terms, would be better than a larger portion of the traffic at unremunerative rates. Moreover, the stronger lines considered that they could afford to concede something to the weaker, as by so doing they would obtain protection for their larger interests. It was in the nature of a payment for insurance against injuries which might otherwise be inflicted. From that standpoint it was expedient; and, from the earliest competition in England to the present time, "joint-purse arrangements," as they are called, have continued; and it is further stated that rate wars, as witnessed periodically in America, are there unknown.

Popular antipathy was, in this country, aroused against "pools"—as they were erroneously termed—because they were declared to be contrary to public policy, and established for the purpose of maintaining extortionate rates. "Competition," we were told, "is the life of trade;" therefore railroad companies must be prevented from limiting it, notwithstanding they might ruin each other in oft-recurring strifes.

Advocates of unregulated competition between railroad companies are usually in favor of government control. By that they mean strict

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supervision without ownership; but, to be consistent, they should advise the purchase of the railroads by the government. In the latter event it seems not to have occurred to the opponents of pooling that the strongest conceivable pool would be inaugurated. The government would not need to determine the percentage of traffic which each road in a given territory should receive, in order to prevent a scramble for the business. It would simply prescribe the rates which should govern, as it does the tariff that shall prevail on imports, or the charges for postal service; and no deviation therefrom would be tolerated. That would be the inevitable result of single ownership, whether by the government or by associated individuals. Or, if the government controlled a portion of the railroads (as is the case in Germany), those would, to ensure their profitable operation, be forced to agree with the companies privately owned, upon divisions of competitive traffic.

I will now describe only one additional cause of controversy between railroad companies. It proceeds from the unwillingness of responsible officers to complain of or prosecute their rivals for violations of law. Aside from the natural reluctance to turn informer, there is the greater deterrent that the company which exposes another, and thereby breaks up a deal enjoyed by large shippers, is sure to be boycotted by the parties in question. For that reason no road can afford to pose as a reformer; and as the evidence upon which to proceed is obtainable only from principals, it is denied to officers of the government or to agents jointly employed by the carriers. Much vague sentiment in this connection has been expressed by men whose capital consists of theories. The boycott can be and is practised by large shippers against carriers whom they deem too particular, with more fatal effect than it has ever been enforced by tyrannical trade-unions. Therein lies a strong argument for "associations," the chairman of which, being impersonal and not connected with one road more than with others, can fearlessly execute reforms; because the vengeance defeated shippers would wreak upon a railroad, if any of its officers were known to be leaders, they cannot visit upon one who is exclusively employed by an organization.

Having sufficiently described the cause of rate wars, a possible cure may be indicated. Of necessity it must be within the law; therefore, as matters now stand, pools, as a remedy, are excluded. Perhaps it may be found in the words "responsibility" and "accountability." The responsibility for each disastrous break in rates should be located, and the punishment due should be inflicted without fear or favor. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to make such a remedy effective, there should be constituted a board or syndicate of bankers, representing investors in corporate properties. Such an organization would be in a position to say to each company: "We will commend your securities so long as your property is managed conservatively; but if it should appear that your officers are acting recklessly, or are wilful disturbers, we will advise the public to let your stocks and bonds alone." A statement of that kind, from men of authority in financial circles, would speedily subdue the most belligerent, and presumably compel the directors of the company concerned to give their immediate attention to the troubles, with the probable result that the disturbances would cease. The remedy is simple, but there need be no doubt as to its efficacy. No man, however rich or powerful, would disregard an intimation of the character described; while the possibility of its receipt would restrain those who depend on the confidence of others for their employment.

It is monstrous that affairs so vast as are those represented by railroad systems should be at the mercy of any petulant official, or be subject to the caprice of an ordinary agent. And yet one solicitor, by accepting the misstatements of a shipper in preference to the denial of a rival, can plunge the roads in a given section into a ruinous strife, simply because the authority to establish rates of transportation (which is conferred upon the directors) has, by the latter, been devolved upon the managers, who in turn have delegated it to subordinates whose chief ambition is to accumulate tonnage. It is a sad commentary upon modern methods, which in other branches of railroad service have reached such a high state of efficiency, that the earning power of a road can be and often is wasted by irresponsible agents, without attracting notice from those whom the stockholders elected to look after their interests. In most cases directors are non-residents, hence are remote from scenes of conflict; but as it is those altercations which absorb dividends, the directors could find profitable employment in watching the course of affairs, and administering sharp rebukes when a disposition to injure the properties becomes manifest. If the directors of each prominent corporation would awake to their duty, and would appoint one of their number to act with others similarly named, as a standing committee to inspect the traffic affairs of the interested roads, a degree of prudence and honesty would be infused into those departments which would contrast favorably with the present laxity and depravity.

The foregoing scheme contemplates the creation of competent tribunals for the suppression of riotous conduct in the operation of rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roads. This it proposes to do by emphasizing the restraints embodied in responsibility and accountability. Here it may be remarked that the Interstate Commerce law contains those features; but prosecution by a tribunal which threatens fines and imprisonment is likely to be abortive, as those penalties have proven. Infinitely more effective and much more practical would be an investigation by a board or a committee, as hereinbefore suggested, than would any machinery that Congress could set in motion. The first named would reach the corporation in its most sensitive part, provided its admonitions were disregarded, by affecting its securities; and the second would retire those convicted of destroying the revenues of the roads concerned. Either remedy could be swiftly employed without the delay incident to judicial investigations, and hence would be so effective that, after one or two convictions, the example set would be sufficient. Moreover, those who were cognizant of wrong-doings would have no hesitation in reporting them to a board appointed to receive complaints and to protect the united properties; because, as the agents of the owners, they would be able to shield those who aided them, by placing a premium upon candor and conservatism, and thereby reversing the rule which now obtains.

The inevitable result of surveillance and publicity as above would be to concentrate the rate-making power in fewer hands. It should, on all competitive traffic, rest with one man on each system. Those men, having clearly-defined authority, could, in each important group, constitute a board for the equitable regulation of common interests. Co-existent with such boards, and to give effect to their acts, should be organizations that would promote co-operation and ensure uniformity in rules. But all these methods will prove unavailing unless adequate provision be made for the arbitration of disagreements. There are so many conflicting interests to be reconciled, and such contrary opinions are likely to be firmly held, that deadlocks will occur and contests follow, if it be not provided in advance that recourse shall be had to arbitration whenever the parties to a traffic contract are unable to agree. For that purpose a permanent board should be appointed, or rules be adopted for the prompt creation of competent tribunals. International difficulties between civilized countries are now rarely submitted to the arbitrament of the sword. That is a relic of barbarism which recognizes only the right of might. In like manner the ultimate determination of differences between corporations—involving, as they frequently do, by resort to strife, the entire resources of confiding stockholders—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be relegated to the unruly past, and a future of profit, harmony, and propriety be inaugurated, by the adoption of arbitration as the final recourse in the event of disagreements between common carriers.

The suggestions made necessitate the provision of the instrumentalities requisite to consider every question which may arise concerning two or more common carriers. They imply the formation of associations, wherein each company is accorded fair representation, to adjust differences in an orderly way, and, failing therein, to ensure their determination by reference to disinterested parties. The opportunity having thus been afforded to obtain due consideration by a jury of peers of every claim presented, no great hardship would be wrought if, in the event of continued disagreement, a settlement be enforced by arbitration. Should all those agencies fail to avert trouble, the responsibility for whatever loss might ensue would not then be difficult to locate, and the duty devolved upon the higher board suggested would be comparatively simple of performance.

The remedy indicated for the prevention of rate wars may therefore be summarized as follows:

1. Create a board of financiers which shall mark for disapproval properties that are unwisely administered.

2. Appoint a standing committee, consisting of one director from each prominent railroad system in a given territory, which shall promptly inquire into and locate the responsibility for any rate war that may occur.

3. Concentrate the rate-making authority on all competitive traffic in the hands of one man upon each system or railroad, and provide for its exclusive exercise by such officer.

4. Form comprehensive associations in each well-defined group, for the proper consideration of questions of common interest, the several members to be adequately represented in the deliberations.

5. Provide for the prompt arbitration of all disagreements, as they arise, between any two or more parties to a traffic association.

Agreements drawn upon the lines indicated, and approved by the directors of the several assenting companies, will be certain to usher in much better conditions between rival carriers than have yet been known; and as mere truces have characterized operations hitherto, anything which gives reasonable promise of enduring peace, with its guarantee of stability in charges and equality of treatment to all patrons under like circumstances, is assuredly deserving of a fair trial.

JOHN W. MIDGLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NAVAL ASPECTS OF THE JAPAN-CHINA WAR.

Is there anything to be learned from the recent war between China and Japan? This is a question which I have frequently been asked since my return to England last July, and the matters on which I am most usually questioned are as to the relative value of ironclads, fast cruisers, quick-firing guns, torpedoes, and modern naval implements of warfare generally. Public attention is directed mainly to the technical points at issue, which it was naturally hoped would receive illustration from the action of well-equipped fleets representing the newest developments of naval warfare. In speaking of "well-equipped" fleets, I am only referring generally to the fact of the ships of both Powers being fairly up to date, though on the Chinese side there was much to be desired in points of detail. There was, however, no such broad distinction between the material of the fleets of China and Japan as to invalidate the lessons to be drawn from actual naval conflict; yet from this point of view the naval operations are singularly barren of results, and the reasons for this must be looked for elsewhere.

What, then, are the lessons of the war? The principal lesson is obviously a moral one, and it lies deep in the traditions and temperaments of the two nations. The warlike, go-ahead Japanese have won all along the line, while the peaceable, conservative Chinese have disastrously failed to make any respectable defence of their hearths and homes. I leave to others the task of developing this theme as fully as it deserves, my object in this article being rather to deal with facts than to dwell on the causes of the war or the characteristics of the two nations. But the differences to which I have alluded must be constantly borne in mind as the most important factor in the whole problem of how it was that the 400,000,000 of Chinese could make no head against the 40,000,000 "Wojen" (dwarfs)—the term by which the Chinese insolently described their Japanese conquerors.

Though it is not my task to deal fully with the important point here raised, it needs more than a passing mention, and I cannot leave the subject without some further remarks. It is as true now as in former ages, that, if a nation is to attain to power or to retain it, it must not only be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as "the strong man armed," but it must inculcate in its citizens the manly virtues of patriotism, loyalty, and heroism. Though Bacon tells us that "no nation need expect to be great unless it makes the study of arms its principal honor and occupation," this axiom has not received general acceptance of recent years. In England, in the British colonies, and to some extent in America, it became the fashion some years since to talk of wars as improbable, to eulogize the theoretical merits of arbitration, and to advocate the substitution of a cosmopolitan altruism for Old World patriotism. In England, the peace-at-any-price party and the Cobden school urged that energies should be directed to the arts of peace and money-making; and though recent events in America and Europe have shown that wars are still the last arguments not only of kings, but of peoples, the teachings of the free-trade league still remain with us as pious opinions to be accepted at least in theory.

The Chinese have acted consistently on these principles, and have afforded us an object-lesson of the value of the theory. It is true that after the French war in 1883–84 they erected batteries on their coast-line, bought ships in Europe, and even built a few in their own dock-yards, where their arsenals were improved so as to be equal to the supply of heavy guns and modern arms of precision: but these activities were mainly for show, to impress the foreigner; and the mandarins and *literati* who rule the country thought that nothing further was required. That any attention should be given to the adaptation of these war materials to war seemed to them unnecessary, and was not appreciated by the all-predominant civilian element. War, in the opinion of the ruling classes, was a most improbable event, and the war training of both officers and men was ignored, or was conducted in the most perfunctory manner. The examinations for officers in the army still, as from time immemorial, consisted in firing from a bow on horseback and in lifting heavy weights, while the greater number of their soldiers were still armed with bows and arrows, and with huge spears resembling pitchforks. Their main trust, even in the recent war, was in the heavy "gingall," a brass piece held on the shoulders of two men, and firing a ball of about half a pound weight. That this should be possible while their arsenals at Kiangnan, Nanking, or Tientsin were capable of turning out 4.7″ quick-firing guns, Maxims, improved Lee-Mitford and other rifles in use in modern armies, shows clearly that no attempt had been made to grasp the meaning of modern warfare.

I have spoken of the mandarins as being hopelessly ignorant of war, and I propose to illustrate this by an example. In the middle of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, when the Japanese had crossed the Yalu, defeating the Chinese General Sung in several engagements, with Port Arthur about to fall, and when even Shan-hai-kwan, only 120 miles from Peking, was threatened, it was evident, even to the mandarins composing the Tsung-li-Yamen, that "something must be done," and the first step was to find a capable general. In this emergency it would be supposed that they would have endeavored to select a man in the prime of life, with at least some knowledge of war as conducted by foreigners, attaching to his staff men like General von Hanneken, with other foreign officers; but this would have been common sense, and consequently it was not the Chinese view. Von Hanneken, an able military officer who had served in the German army, had been indeed appointed as assistant to Admiral Ting, and he did yeoman's service in the *Ting Yuen* at the Yalu fight, though he was naturally ignorant of naval matters. Later, about a month before the fall of Wei-Hai-Wei, Ting had another assistant in the person of "Admiral"[1] McClure, a Scotch tug-captain; but throughout the war it seems to have been impossible for the Chinese mind to grasp the simple fact of the necessity for expert training so pithily expressed in the old adage of "the cobbler to his last." But this digression is interesting only as showing that even when the Chinese did condescend to employ foreigners they placed them in positions for which they were not fitted by previous training. In the case now under consideration, the man selected to be the savior of his country must, they thought, be a Chinaman of high rank, and he was found in the Viceroy of Nanking, Liu-kun-yi, a mandarin of mandarins about seventy years of age, a confirmed opium-smoker, and so infirm that he was incapable of ascending a staircase. Conscious of his physical incapacity, and of his absolute ignorance of war, he attempted to decline the honor thrust upon him; but the appointment had been approved by the Emperor, and the Viceroy had perforce to accept the responsibility, though he took care not to go within a hundred miles of the front. The reason for the appointment is to be found in the fact that Liu-kun-yi was a Hunan man, and the Hunanese are universally credited in China with being a fighting race, though their reputation is founded rather on their turbulence, and on their invincible hostility to the "foreign devils," than on any proved courage in the field.

I have said enough, and more than enough, to prove the absolute ignorance of warfare shown by the Chinese. Of generals and admirals

[1] I have in all cases given the nominal rank of foreign officers serving in the Chinese service in quotation-marks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the modern sense they had none, and the necessity for experts in war was deliberately ignored. I am inclined to think that the view of the accomplished Chinese mandarin is that war is a dirty business, in which only the worst characters should take part, and that the most noted swashbuckler and rowdy is the general. The warlike virtues, manly exercises, and the use of arms form no part of a Chinese mandarin's education, and are looked upon as derogatory. Foreign instructors in Chinese naval colleges have told me that it was a far harder task to get their pupils to take part in gymnastic or calisthenic exercises than to attain proficiency in scientific knowledge.

This, then, being the Chinese view, how are we to account for the fact that undoubtedly the Chinese had made some progress in modern armament and equipment. Their army generally, as I have shown, was no doubt inefficient; there was no cohesion between the various branches of which it was composed; and it may be doubted whether the Chinese could ever be said to have had an army at all in the modern sense. Yet there was a drilled body supposed to consist of 30,000 men, though probably really numbering about 15,000, who were well armed with Krupp guns and magazine rifles; while in the Pei Yang or Northern Squadron, which had been trained by Captain Lang, a British naval officer, it was known that they had a naval force of modern ships, built in England or Germany, which cruised much at sea, visiting Japan and Singapore, and, so far as outward appearances went, formed an efficient fighting squadron. What became of these trained soldiers was always a mystery. Some, at least, went down with the unfortunate *Kowshing* on the 25th of July, 1894, while many of the Krupp guns were captured at Ping Yang on the 16th of September; but either the number of trained soldiers was much exaggerated, or a large proportion were kept in reserve in the vicinity of the Viceroy's Yamen at Tientsin, which would be quite in accordance with the half-hearted way in which the Chinese are accustomed to conduct warlike operations.

In speaking of their navy I have alluded to the Pei Yang Squadron as being apparently efficient, and here I must explain that there were other squadrons under various viceroys,—the Nanyang or Nanking Squadron, the Foo-chow and Canton squadrons; but the weakness of the central government was such that there was no cohesion between the forces paid for by the viceroys of the different provinces of the empire, and only an odd ship or two from any of the three squadrons referred to ever took part in the war. In fact they were never sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed to be more than "show" ships. This could not be said of the Pei Yang Squadron. It is true that Captain Lang had been gotten rid of by a cabal some three years previous to the outbreak of the war, and there were sinister rumors of a rapid deterioration in discipline[1] since his guiding hand had been withdrawn, while no one believed that the necessary stores and reserves were kept up. Still they were well navigated; they kept station fairly when in company; they fired well at a mark, both with guns and torpedoes; they exchanged semaphores with each other in English; and they were certainly not a "negligible quantity." That they were lacking in other ways admits of no question. Officers had allowances to enable them to supply various stores, and thus the canker of peculation and dishonesty had eaten deep into the vitals of the efficiency of the squadron. There was little zeal, no real *esprit de corps*, and the most successful captain was the man who could make most money. Of Admiral Ting,[2] who commanded the Pei Yang Squadron, I would speak with respectful sympathy. He was a gallant, patriotic man, but he had been a cavalry officer, who had taken to sea service in middle age; and, deficient as he was in technical knowledge, he was much in the hands of Commodore Lew-po-chin,[2] his flag-captain in the *Ting Yuen*.

The credit for such efficiency as the Pei Yang Squadron and the foreign-drilled troops possessed is entirely due to one man, the famous Viceroy of Chihli, Li Hung Chang, undoubtedly the foremost if not the only statesman in China. He has a world-wide reputation and has been called "the Chinese Bismarck." I do not propose to describe him, but his manly presence and hearty shake of the hand show that he is no mere mandarin, while in spite of his more than seventy years he has still a fund of energy sufficient to enable him to make laborious inspections of his troops and ships, as he did in May, 1894, two months before the outbreak of war. This war has to some extent discredited him; he is probably not free from the vice to which old men are supposed to be especially liable; and it is certain that many deficiencies and failures in munitions of war were directly due to the determination to exact "squeezes" from those nearly related to him,

[1] A story, for the truth of which I cannot vouch, was current in the clubs at Hong-Kong and Shanghai, that, a short time after "Admiral" Lang's dismissal, an Englishman going on board the *Ting Yuen* unexpectedly, found the admiral playing "fan-tan" with the sentry over his cabin door.

[2] After making terms with Admiral Ito for the surrender of the remaining ships and the island of Liu-kung-Tau both these officers committed suicide.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while no doubt his military knowledge was small. But he had no delusions on the subject of China's military power; he knew the hollowness of all the seeming show; and I feel certain that he was always anxious for peace. In 1884 he arranged the treaty of peace with France; in 1885, when war was imminent with Japan, he sacrificed much in the interests of peace, though the treaty he then made with Count Ito proved to have in it the seeds of the recent war; and I am convinced that he would have given way at all points and have averted the war had he been entirely master of the situation. In the negotiations for peace, held between Li Hung Chang and Count Ito at Shimonoseki in April last, he is reported to have said to the latter: "What you have done for Japan I wanted to imitate in China. Had you been in my place, you would know the unspeakable difficulties met with in China."

I have dwelt long on China's corruption, on her unpreparedness for war, and the incapacity shown by her rulers to appreciate modern warfare, as it is the crux of the problem. Let us now turn to Japan, and the contrast is enormous. In China, as we have seen, peace and the arts of peace are held up as models, while war and the heroic virtues are habitually ignored. In Japan, on the contrary, while art is held in high esteem, and the industry and enterprise of the people lead them to be active traders and producers, it is the warlike virtues of patriotism, and devotion to death for a cause, which alone are deemed worthy of public recognition. That everything should give way to this—domestic affection, nay, even ordinary morality—is the accepted creed, if we may judge by that popular Japanese legend of "the Forty-seven Ronans," whose graves may be seen in Tokyo to this day, decked with "votos" from fervent Japanese admirers. The story should be read to be appreciated. It relates the heroic conduct of the forty-seven "Ronans," or retainers, in avenging the murder of their Daimio by a rival,—the stratagems and deceits necessary to accomplish the object in view being represented as not only excusable, but commendable.

Japan has been so much written about, especially in America, that I feel that it is unnecessary for me to say more about this quick-witted, courteous, and patriotic people. That they are as warlike as the Chinese are the reverse, I have endeavored to show, and when once they had been coerced or persuaded to open their country to foreigners, they proceeded to organize their navy and army on European models, availing themselves of the best European instructors, and proving themselves to be apt pupils. Captain Ingles, of the British navy, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for many years was their naval adviser, had expressed his opinion, long before the war, that the Japanese navy was fully up to the European standard; and similar reports had been made by distinguished military officers concerning their army. Few can now doubt that for some three years before the war broke out they had been preparing for it in their usual silent, systematic manner, and when the Tonghak rebellion gave rise to the Corean imbroglio they were fully prepared for action.

Were they anxious to "flesh the spears" of their new navy and army *à la* Cetewayo?—or was the war mainly due to political exigencies of home politics?—or were they simply drawn into the war by the evident leaning of the Corean monarch and people toward China, to the exclusion of Japanese influence? All these may have had their effect, but to one who was in Japan at the time it was no secret that the Japanese to a man were as anxious for war as their opponents were to avert it; and though it may be a pious opinion, to be held by the Japanese, that on the 25th of July, 1894, the Chinese cruiser *Tsi Yuen* had the temerity to fire the first shot against a very superior Japanese force, it is so contrary to nature that on this point at least we must be permitted to believe the Chinese version of the collision which practically began the war.

Well, the war broke out, as we have seen, with the engagement above referred to: the Chinese ships being the *Tsi Yuen* and *Kwang Yih*, a torpedo-cruiser of 1,600 tons; and the Japanese First Squadron consisting of the *Yoshino*, flying the flag of Rear-Admiral Tsuboi, the *Akitsushima*, *Naniwa*, and *Takachiho*. The Chinese ships had left Yasan that morning, and the Japanese ships were the advanced squadron of Admiral Ito's fleet making for Chemulpho. In this engagement the *Kwang Yih* was driven ashore and destroyed; the *Tsi Yuen*, though inferior in speed and force to all the four Japanese ships, escaping to Wei-Hai-Wei much damaged. It was a few hours after this that the Chinese gunboat *Trao Kiang* was captured, and the British transport *Kowshing*, with "General" Von Hanneken and picked Chinese troops on board, was sunk by the *Naniwa*, Captain (now Rear-Admiral) Togo, after what Admiral Ito, in a recent address delivered at Tokyo, terms "several hours of useless parleyings."

For obvious reasons I am precluded from touching on the legal aspect of the sinking of the *Kowshing*, which has, it appears to me, only afforded a fresh instance of the want of cohesion in the bundle of sticks which goes by the name of "international law," of which it may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasonable to say, in St. Paul's words, that, though all things may be lawful, all things may not be expedient. As regards the manner in which it was done I cannot forbear pointing out that though 44 Chinese were taken off the masts of the sunken vessel by the French gunboat *Lion* on the morning following her destruction, neither here, nor at Yasan, Yalu, or Wei-Hai-Wei was, so far as I heard, a single Chinese life saved by their Japanese opponents; so that, kindly and amiable as the latter are by nature, they have much to learn as regards common humanity in war.

The war then began in earnest with the sinking of the *Kowshing*, and the attack on the Chinese camp at Yasan which immediately followed. I must leave the military operations to others, but it will now be advisable to make a general comparison of the naval forces of the two Powers. They were not unequal. On paper, indeed, the Chinese were superior in number and tonnage; but this assumed that the Chinese auxiliary squadrons were available and efficient, which I have shown not to be the case; and for all practical purposes the Japanese were the more powerful and better able to command the sea. The Japanese knew that they would have to do with the Pei Yang Squadron, and they had gauged it at its true value.

Let us now examine the material force of the two fleets, and for the moment take no note of the *morale*. In tonnage, in number of men,[1] in quick-firing guns, and above all in speed, the Japanese fleet under Vice-Admiral Ito was superior. It was also more homogeneous, as, omitting the *Akagi*, the ships varied in size only from 2,200 to 4,200 tons, and were more modern. In all these respects the Chinese fleet was inferior, but it had one advantage in two second-class battle-ships, the *Ting Yuen* and *Chen Yuen*, of 7,400 tons; but the next in size were the *King Yuen* and *Lai Yuen*,—weak ships, though nominally "armored cruisers" of 2,900 tons; and when we come to the last three ships we find that they were all sloops of 1,300 tons. It might well have puzzled a more experienced sailor than Admiral Ting to manœuvre such an odd lot of ships together. But we are not now considering the Yalu battle, to which I shall again refer, but I have taken the ships engaged in it as sufficient for a comparison of the two fleets.

Clearly the Japanese considered that they could successfully command the sea, and in no war has the "influence of sea power," so

[1] I have been unable to ascertain the correct number of men in the Chinese ships; but many of them were short of their complement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admirably worked out in Captain Mahan's able volumes, been more distinctly shown. "*À quoi peut servir une marine?*" asks the French Admiral Jurien de la Gravière. His reply to his question is "*À occuper les grandes voies maritimes;*" and, to quote Bacon again, "he who has command of the sea can take as much or as little of the war as he pleases." The Japanese, having determined to turn the Chinese out of Corea, required the command of the sea to enable their troops to be brought across from Japan, and to maintain them when there; but had they been defeated by land, they could then have re-embarked their troops and have taken "as little of the war as they pleased," assuming that they retained their naval superiority.

The sea was also the shortest route for the Chinese, as we have seen in the case of the *Kowshing;* but after the war broke out they were unwilling to risk their fleet, and, until the landing of troops at Takushan, which brought on the Yalu fight on the 17th of September, they accepted the serious disadvantage of having to send their troops into Corea by the long land route.

Was the whole advantage of sea power, however, fully understood in either country? This seems doubtful, as in the early part of the war the Japanese fleet was mainly employed in convoying troops; while the Chinese, although cruising freely in the Gulf of Pechili, were said to be under orders not to cruise to the eastward of a line drawn from the Shantung promontory to the Yalu. In both countries the naval force seems to have been used in subordination to the military requirements and for secondary purposes,—a misapprehension of sea power which, as Captain Mahan shows, was too frequently the bane of the French navies in their wars with Great Britain. This is a question of strategy not entirely in the hands of the naval commander-in-chief, and one must hesitate to make Vice-Admiral Ito, who in other respects showed himself to be a most able commander, responsible for it; but in his lecture, to which I have before referred, he appears to accept the rôle as the natural one.

It is possible that the Japanese were aware of the orders given to the Chinese ships, and that they did not wish to force a naval action till they had secured their military bases; but the policy would have been a dangerous one in the face of an active enemy; and, well supplied as they were with fast cruisers,—such as the *Yoshino*, *Naniwa*, *Takachiho*, *Chiyoda*, and others,—the neglect to keep touch with the Chinese fleet argues a failure to appreciate sea power in its true aspects. As a matter of fact, the Chinese fleet, even after the Yalu battle, was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so far left unwatched that Admiral Ting remained at Port Arthur a fortnight after the landing of the Japanese troops at Pitzewo on the 24th of October for the purpose of attacking the fortress, Admiral Ito being content to cruise for the protection of his transports, and allowing the Chinese squadron to proceed unmolested to Wei-Hai-Wei. It is clear that there was no attempt here at blockade, or even masking, though the two fleets were within seventy miles of each other for at least a fortnight, and it would have been easy to have sealed the Chinese ships up in Port Arthur, where they could have done little or nothing for the defence of the place, and where they must have been taken when the position fell.

On the 10th of August, again, at the beginning of the war, Admiral Ito appeared off Wei-Hai-Wei with a fleet of twenty-two ships in all, and exchanged a few shots with the batteries; but the Chinese squadron was not in the port, nor I believe at Port Arthur, so that it was naturally expected that the Japanese admiral would have endeavored to find his opponents and bring them to action,—Port Arthur and Wei-Hai-Wei being the only fortified harbors the Chinese had in the north; but he was content to proceed south the next day, leaving Admiral Ting free to cruise as he pleased, and Chinese transports to cross the Gulf of Pechili without risk of capture. Ting was, I believe, off the Yalu at the time to which I refer, and it would certainly have simplified matters for the Japanese had the naval action taken place, say on the 11th of August, with similar results to that of the 17th of September, more than a month later.

I have now dealt with the naval strategy of the war, and I have endeavored to show that the Japanese did not make full use of their naval predominance; and I now turn to their tactics, which were admirable in all cases. The way in which Marshal Yamagata's force was convoyed to Chemulpho by Admiral Ito, with his look-out ships and advanced squadron covering the main body of the fleet, which was concentrated in readiness to repel any hostile attack, showed a full appreciation of the necessities of the case; while at Pitzewo, before the attack on Port Arthur, and at Yung Ching Bay, when attacking Wei-Hai-Wei, the systematic cruising to prevent surprise, and in the latter case to keep touch with the enemy, which was done in great part by torpedo-boats, showed that the Japanese had little to learn from older navies. The torpedo-boat cruising off Wei-Hai-Wei in January and February, with the thermometer often little above zero, and with frequent gales, was first-rate; the officers and men showing wonderful spirit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as good seamanship in carrying out this most trying service. I doubt if any European navy could have done it as well. In other respects, too, the Japanese navy showed how thoroughly the problems of modern naval requirements had been mastered. The ships kept wonderfully efficient, being attended by their colliers, hospital and ammunition ships, and "nurses" for the torpedo-boats; the coaling being carried on almost continuously, when at anchor, by their own boats, which carried the coal in grass bags containing about half a hundredweight each. The landing of the troops was carried on mainly by sampans, and by coolies admirably organized; the navy remaining prepared for service, an inshore squadron only assisting with steamboats.

But now to return to the naval battle of the Yalu. The very accurate account of the battle given (in the "Century Magazine" for August, 1895) by "Commander" McGiffin, a former American naval officer, makes it unnecessary for me to give it in detail; and Captain Mahan's remarks in the same magazine are so much to the point that I need only refer to a few circumstances, and to the matters on which I have been so frequently questioned, as set forth in the opening paragraph of this article.

Let us look at the tactics of the two admirals. The Chinese fleet, which had been at anchor when the Japanese were sighted, immediately weighed and attempted to adopt a fighting formation said to have been advocated by Captain Lang. It consisted in the ships acting in pairs in quarter line, the fleet thus forming a sort of indented line abreast; but it would be more properly described technically as "subdivisions (of 2 ships) in quarter line in line abreast," the leaders of subdivisions being only two cables apart. In arranging the pairs, sister ships worked together: thus the *Ting Yuen* and *Chen Yuen* formed a pair; the *Chao Yung* and *Yang Wei* formed another pair; and so on. The arrangement has much to recommend it, but it essentially demands specially well-trained officers accustomed to manœuvre in this formation. Under the circumstances it was a fatal error. As a matter of fact the formation was never completed, and if it was right to station the two big ships in the centre, it was certainly wrong to put the two weakest, the *Chao Yung* and the *Yang Wei*, as wing ships. These latter were tailing astern, as were others, so that to the approaching Japanese the Chinese appeared to be formed in a wedge or V shape.

The Chinese formation being as above, the Japanese attack was delivered in line ahead, and Captain Mahan justly criticises both admirals,—the Chinese for having placed his weakest ships on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wings, and the Japanese for moving diagonally across the front of the enemy to pass around his right wing. But though this might be dangerous against a well-drilled squadron of equal force, we must remember that to Ito the Chinese appeared to be formed in a sort of wedge, and he reasonably trusted to the better speed of his ships and to the unwieldy formation of his enemy to avert ill effects. Like Nelson's at Trafalgar, the formation might not be theoretically perfect, but it was sufficiently good to lead up to victory, and perhaps after all was practically the best under the circumstances. In the lecture before referred to, Admiral Ito says:—

> "I ordered the First Squadron to attack the right wing of the enemy, and then to come in upon his rear, utilizing for this purpose the great speed of the First Squadron."

He then states how by this attack the *Chao Yung* was quickly disabled and set on fire, and that Admiral Ting—

> —"concentrated his chief attack upon my Principal Squadron. I managed to keep as far away from him as possible, with a view to attacking him from both sides—front and rear—when the First Squadron got astern of him."

This fully explains the intention of the Japanese admiral, who decided to take advantage of his better speed to give full effect to his strength in quick-firing guns.

I may here remark that though the nominal speed of the Japanese ships only averaged some three knots more than that of the Chinese squadron, owing to their being newer and better cared for, I have reason to believe that five knots would more fairly represent the real difference, the *Chao Yung* and *Yang Wei*, for instance,—nominally sixteen-knot ships,—being incapable of steaming more than seven knots. Practically, after the first collision, the Chinese lost all order, and contented themselves with a vain endeavor to keep bows on to their enemy,—an impossible problem which the advocates of bow-fire *quand même* should note. The Japanese, on the other hand, were always under control, and manœuvred effectually together in compliance with signal. Indeed it was not till the two Chinese ironclads were left alone, that the latter seem to have recovered any initiative, and the only wonder is that the Japanese did not succeed in destroying the whole of the rest of the squadron.

Before leaving the Yalu battle I should like to refer to some instances of special gallantry on both sides. On the Chinese side the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

captain of the *Chih Yuen* is stated to have fought his ship with great determination: she was pushed forward toward the Japanese fleet in an attempt to ram, and was sunk by a storm of shot, though she continued firing to the last. The *Lai Yuen*, on fire so badly that the whole of her after part was literally burned out, was saved by the gallantry of her first lieutenant and brought to Port Arthur. It is stated that the captain proposed to run the ship ashore, but that the first lieutenant, who was down at the fire, persisted that it could be got under, and owing to his noble example this was eventually done.

In the Japanese squadron all seem to have behaved well. The *Hiyei* and little *Akagi*, having been left behind owing to their slow speed, were practically cut off from the remainder of their fleet, and had to run the gauntlet through the whole of the Chinese fleet, narrowly escaping destruction. Both ships were so much damaged as to be put out of action, the *Akagi* having her captain killed and her foremast shot away. The most notable instance of heroism, however, is stated to have occurred in the *Matsushima*. A shell from the *Chen Yuen* had exploded three of the heavy charges for the thirteen-inch gun, which had imprudently been allowed to accumulate in an exposed position, causing a loss of fifty killed and wounded, and there was imminent danger of the ship being blown up. It is stated that this would have happened but for the heroism of a petty officer stationed in the handing-room, who with great presence of mind instantly closed the door of the magazine, placing his back against it. It is satisfactory to hear that this man's life was saved, though he was badly burned.

I do not propose to follow the Yalu battle further. The Japanese only destroyed the four ships, *King Yuen*, *Chih Yuen*, *Chao Yung*, and *Yang Wei*,—the *Kwan Chia* being wrecked the same night off Talicuwhan Bay; and the two Chinese ironclads made such a good defence that toward nightfall Admiral Ito withdrew. But the victory was complete, and from the 17th of September the Pei Yang fleet, as a fighting squadron capable of meeting the Japanese fleet on equal terms, had ceased to exist. It might still be a "fleet in being," but so crushed and humiliated, as well as reduced in numbers, as to be of little value.

The obvious lessons to be drawn from the fight are as follows:—

1. **The necessity for keeping a fleet under command.**
2. **The advantage of the offensive.**
3. **The advantage of speed.**
4. **The advantage of quick-firing guns.**
5. **The necessity of special precautions against fire, and of removing all woodwork.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6. The uselessness (or worse) of thin screens or shields to guns.
7. The necessity for not having accumulations of heavy-gun charges in exposed positions.

On the two last points only is it necessary to make any remarks. As regards the sixth lesson, the conclusion is drawn rather from the action of the 25th of July, and from the attack on Wei-Hai-Wei, than from the Yalu battle. On the 25th of July the shield of the *Tsi Yuen's* starboard eight-inch gun was struck by a shot, causing some loss to the gun's crew, and sending a shower of splinters across the deck, which killed or wounded nearly the whole crew of the opposite gun of similar calibre. As the result of this experience the Chinese had landed all their gun-shields before the Yalu fight. The second instance is one drawn from Wei-Hai-Wei, when a shot from the Chinese batteries struck the shield of a machine-gun of the *Yoshino*, causing a loss of two killed and seven wounded, none of whom would have been touched but for the protecting (?) shield.

With reference to the seventh lesson, the danger of the accumulation of powder is not a new one, and, as Captain Mahan argues, it is probably better to run some risk of explosion than for ammunition to be unavailable at a critical period.

On the above points there can be little difference of opinion; but tnere are others more debatable, such as the relative value of belts *versus* deck-plating. On this point constructors may remark with satisfaction that, if we except the *Saikio Maru* transport, no ship in either fleet had her motive power or steering-gear injured. It is also clear that the forty-five Japanese quick-firing guns practically got the better of the eight protected heavy guns in the Chinese ironclads. On the other hand it is claimed that the loss of life in the latter was comparatively small, and that their plating was never pierced by the Japanese projectiles, even though struck several times by the thirteen-inch guns of the *Matsushima* and her two sisters. It must be remembered, too, that the Chinese ironclads were thirteen years old, and that their guns were not of the newest pattern or supplied with a sufficient number of common shell,[1] so that the Yalu battle leaves the great question of armor protection and of cruisers *versus* ironclads much where it was.

What, then, of torpedoes? The Japanese certainly never fired any,

[1] I think it was "Commander" McGiffin who said, referring to the scarcity of common shell for the twelve-inch guns of the *Chen Yuen*, that when one came up from the shell-room during the action, "they nursed that shell, sir, like a hot-house plant."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and never intentionally closed to within fair torpedo range. The Chinese ships fired two or three, but, as I gathered, rather to get rid of them in view of the danger of their being struck by a shot than with any expectation of damaging the enemy. I think we may say, then, that the Yalu battle has proved that at least in a general action above-water torpedo discharges are useless.

I now leave the Yalu battle, and I have only space for a few lines on the lessons to be derived from the operations which ended in the capture of Wei-Hai-Wei. These are not numerous, and they convey nothing new to us. It is evident that a mere passive defence is useless, and generally the Chinese ships refrained from offensive action and became helpless as the net closed around them. It is probable that after the mainland batteries had fallen into the Japanese hands their fleet might have entered the harbor and taken the Chinese ships, demoralized as they were; but no doubt possible submarine torpedoes acted as a deterrent, and Admiral Ito might well feel that his prey could not escape him.

As to the successful torpedo attacks made by the Japanese, by which the *Ting Yuen*, *Lai Yuen*, and *Wei Yuen* were destroyed, whilst appreciating fully the dash and gallantry of the Japanese officers, as well as their splendid devotion and seamanship to which I have already alluded, we must remember that one end of the boom defending the harbor was in Japanese hands, and that the Chinese ships were huddled together as close under the island of Liu-kung-tau as possible, to escape from the fire of the Japanese batteries, making no attempt to defend themselves by an inner boom or other obstructions. The boats accordingly had every advantage, and no doubt the Chinese, as usual, were "surprised" at the attack being delivered from the southwest when they knew that the Japanese torpedo-boats must enter the bay in which they were lying from the east. Still the first attack was a failure, the boats being spitted on the boom, and in the first successful attack one boat got a shot through her boiler, and one was wrecked, though subsequently got off again.

One episode of Wei-Hai-Wei deserves a passing notice. On the 31st of January the Japanese carried all the eastern Chinese forts on the mainland, and as the attempts of the Chinese to blow up the batteries or to disable the guns had been only partially successful, the majority of the guns were serviceable, and, the forts being manned by seamen gunners from the fleet, the guns were quickly turned on the Chinese ships and the batteries on the island. Seeing this, the *Ting Yuen* got

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under way that afternoon, and, taking up a position so as partially to enfilade them, she attacked two of the forts armed with twenty-one and twenty-four six-inch Krupp guns. The attempt was gallantly made, and one gun at least had its muzzle shot off by the ironclads' gunners; but an inspection of the fort—a fine modern one built under Von Hanneken's superintendence—showed the practical invulnerability of modern sea forts against naval attack, though possibly they might be temporarily silenced by a storm of projectiles from quick-firing and machine guns.

In reviewing the naval operations one must constantly read between the lines, and differentiate between Japanese and Chinese; as, unless this is done, they can be made to prove anything. At Wei-Hai-Wei, for instance, we have seen the success of the Japanese torpedo-boats; but the Chinese had twelve torpedo-boats there, and they did nothing, making no attempt to harass the Japanese cruisers or to engage the fourteen Japanese boats. Their career was indeed inglorious. On the 8th of February, during a bombardment of the island of Liu-kung-tau by the Japanese fleet, the twelve Chinese boats attempted to escape to the westward, making for Chefoo. They were immediately chased by the *Yoshino* and other fast cruisers, and were all driven ashore, captured, or destroyed. With two exceptions they were old boats which certainly could not steam fifteen knots; probably twelve would be nearer the mark.

I began this article with the question as to whether there was anything to be learned from the war which I have been considering, and I have endeavored to answer it; but as I proceeded I have become more and more impressed with what an old, old story it is. A nation imbued with courage, skill, and national spirit has triumphed over one which lacked those qualities, trusting to half measures and blind chance; each individual, with rare exceptions, being mainly intent only on saving his own life and his individual interests. Nevertheless, several instances, even in this war, have shown that the Chinese, when well led, are not wanting in courage, and with good organization they may yet become formidable.

From the naval point of view one is struck with the fact of the eternity of general principles in strategy, and even in tactics, modern appliances notwithstanding; and only shallow observers will fail to see the lessons which can be learned from the campaigns of a Nelson, a Rodney, or a Suffren, if care is taken to adapt them to the circumstances of our own times.

E. R. FREMANTLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRIMINAL CROWDING OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—II.

In a previous article[1] I called attention to the overcrowded and unsanitary condition of the public schools in some of our large cities, a condition of which few of the otherwise well-informed residents of those cities were aware, and which the press in numerous editorials on the subject very properly characterized as alarming, shameful, and surpassing belief. I am now able to give more recent facts showing that, bad though the school accommodations were, they are in many cases growing deplorably worse. It should be kept in mind that the following statements are not those of thoughtless alarmists, but that they are based on information furnished by careful and conservative men,—men whose chief concern is for the welfare of the children in the schools, and whose personal interests would incline them to take as favorable a view as possible of the situation. These statements have never been called in question by any one at all familiar with the subject.

The condition of the schools in Brooklyn was miserable in 1893: in 1894 it was disgraceful, as the following extract from the report of the Superintendent of Schools will show:—

"The number of pupils on register in all grades exceeded the total seating capacity by 3,630. The number of pupils on register in primary grades exceeded the seating capacity of our primary-class rooms by 6,322.

It should be remembered, however, that, dreadful as is the condition of crowding shown by these figures, they tell only a part of the truth. They represent an average condition and not extreme cases; they show the register, not when it is at its highest, but when, in midwinter, it is almost at its lowest. To appreciate fully the enormity of the evils caused by lack of sufficient school accommodations, it is necessary to take the register when it is at its highest,—in the month of October,—and to consider, not average conditions, but particular cases. In October, 1893, there were 377 classes whose registers exceeded 60; in October, 1894, there were no less than 447 classes whose registers exceeded 60. Of these 447 classes there were 278 that had registers between 60 and 70; 89 that had registers between 70 and 80; 17 that had registers between 80 and 90; 12 that had registers between 90 and 100; 10 that had registers between 100 and 110; 10 that had registers between 110 and 120; 16 that had registers between 120 and 130; 11 that had registers between 130 and 140; and 4 that had registers between 140 and 150."

[1] "The Criminal Crowding of Public Schools," The Forum, May, 1895.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each of these enormous classes was kept in one room and had but one teacher. Owing to overcrowding, only one half the pupils in primary grades could be taught effectively, and the entire school system was paralyzed and clogged. There were by actual count 14,000 children in Brooklyn "either improperly provided with school accommodations or seeking admission in vain." This condition of affairs galvanized even the city authorities into action, and the legislature was asked for permission to issue bonds to build additional school-houses. The defects of the Brooklyn schools are faithfully indicated by the Superintendent, and that the city is finally taking action in the matter is to a great extent owing to his clear delineation of the facts of the case.

The most important function of a school report is to make known the needs of the schools, and the first step toward reforming the lamentable conditions that exist in many of our cities is to have the facts fully set before the public. We have a right to know the worst, and no man can claim to be a friend of education who wilfully conceals or keeps back such humiliating details. The public schools are largely what public opinion makes them, and it is only by giving the greatest publicity to the crying defects of the system that the proper authorities can be shamed into correcting them.

It is difficult to get at the exact facts with regard to the schools in New York city. There are few towns of 10,000 inhabitants that do not issue a more complete school report than the small pamphlet of 69 pages which embodies the New York report for 1894. On the day when the schools began, in September, 1895, the New York "Herald" announced that there were 50,000 children who would not be able to obtain accommodations. It is to be hoped that this is a large overestimate. Those who desire information as to the character of the accommodations enjoyed by the 200,000 who were so fortunate as to get in are referred to Dr. Douglas H. Stewart's article on "Unsanitary Schools and Public Indifference," in THE FORUM for September, 1895. When we know that thousands are vainly seeking admission to such dark and dingy schools as the city of New York can afford to give her favored children, it is with a sense of the ludicrous that comes sadly near the pathetic that we learn that the new provisions of the Truancy Law are to be strictly enforced, and that parents will be held equally culpable with the children for pupils' absence from school.

In Jersey City, during the year 1893–94, 1,732 applicants were refused admission to the schools, and in September, 1894, there were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1,836 children attending half-day sessions, 1,606 more pupils than seats, and 775 had been refused admission. With that liberality to which we are so well accustomed where matters of education are concerned, the legislature authorized the issue of $250,000 worth of bonds, when $500,000 could have been "wisely, economically, and profitably expended." Owing to lack of funds, the State law of New Jersey, which requires that all books, stationery, and supplies be furnished to pupils free of charge, is systematically violated, and there is little if any money for the purchase of maps, books of reference, and the ordinary school apparatus. The work of the schools is seriously retarded because modern methods which require supplementary books in reading, geography, and other studies cannot be followed for lack of means. That children eager to learn should be turned away from the schools of a prosperous city, is unwise and unpatriotic, and we apparently have yet to learn that efficient schools may be a protection to the state as well as line-of-battle ships and armored cruisers.

Some of the Philadelphia school buildings are known to be defective in many respects, and there are numerous children who are forced to attend on half time, but it is not easy to obtain any information on the subject.

In Washington the wretched conditions of 1893 were accentuated in 1894. Practically all the white schools of the first and second grades, and 2,000 pupils of the third and fourth grades, were limited to half-day sessions, while two-fifths of the entire number of colored schools were in similar straits. Superintendent Powell calls the half-day system for schools above the second grade "a farce," and adds: "To give a lad twelve years of age opportunity to attend school but three and a half hours a day, knowing well that he will spend the rest of the time on the street, is robbery of the boy's time and a danger to society." The children of the poorer classes lose by this system one-half their schooling, because they must begin to earn a living before the time comes when they can enjoy the privilege of an entire day at school. There is one square mile in Washington, "well populated by colored citizens, in which there is no school at all, and several other sections are little better off." We read of floors in the colored-school buildings worn to the thinness of veneer, of window-sashes loose and so badly decayed that they will not retain the glass during a moderate windstorm, thus rendering it almost impossible to heat the rooms. Doors are without proper fastenings, and thousands of dollars' worth of property left without protection.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President of the Board of Trustees of the Public Schools, in his report to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, makes the following statements, which show a situation that we should be more ready to believe of the schools of Pekin than of those of Washington:—

"It will be observed that these unfortunate conditions result solely from the failure to supply adequate schoolroom accommodation. A sufficient number of teachers is provided for all the schools; and if we had as many schoolrooms as are needed, every child now in attendance could receive the benefit of a full day's schooling without the employment of a single additional teacher or the expenditure of a single additional dollar for teachers' salaries. As was pointed out on a former occasion, we occupy precisely the attitude, from a business standpoint, of an employer who finds it necessary to engage and pay the wages of 1,000 skilled employees, but who receives the benefit of only half-day's labor from a third of their number because of his own refusal to provide working-room for them all.

"The showing thus presented is sufficiently unfortunate without the emphasis of any further facts. The board feel it to be their duty, however, both to you and the community, to point out the further fact that the above inadequacy of accommodation remains after resort has been had not only to rented rooms, —which, as shown by Superintendent Powell's report, 'are, without exception, unfit for school purposes, being without ventilation other than open windows and open doors, which are always harmful and fraught with danger, and are without adequate, and in some cases even without respectable, closet accommodation,'— but, even after converting the basements of the school buildings into schoolrooms, rooms never intended for such a purpose and wholly unfit for it, 'having no means of ventilation, no proper means of heating,' and lacking all the necessary conveniences. No member of Congress would consent to the use of such rooms for his committee, or for any other purpose which would require him to pass the working-hours of the day in them; and no member, we are confident, would be willing to condemn the immature bodies of little school children to conditions, sanitary and otherwise, so unfavorable."

In Baltimore, during the year ending December 31, 1894, there were 4,500 children who were housed in rented buildings that were "generally old dwellings or halls unfit for school use and detrimental to the health of those who occupy them." In some such wretched room it is by no means unusual to crowd two schools with their teachers, where the school authorities frankly admit that there is only a sufficient supply of air for one class. There is not unnatural complaint that by these unwholesome conditions the health of teachers and pupils is impaired, and many children are deprived of educational advantages, because their parents dare not expose them to such risks. The appropriations for new school-houses are too small to permit of the erection of proper buildings, and the superintendent regrets that the classrooms in most new buildings are not large enough to allow sufficient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

space outside the desks for persons to move about the room, and that there is not room enough in front of the desks for the placing of blackboards, maps, and other necessary apparatus for teaching.

In addition to the foregoing facts, Baltimore is, I believe, unique among cities of its size in that it possesses no training-school where its teachers may be equipped for their work. Surely the educated men and women of Baltimore must be ignorant of this condition of affairs, or they would make such a stir as would force even the City Council to provide proper schools.

Chicago labors under exceptional difficulties. There is probably no other city in the world where such an annual increase of population has to be provided for. The city is growing at the rate of 65,000 yearly, and 13,000 of this number are children of school age. Fifteen new buildings are imperatively required to accommodate this increase, and fourteen more for the nearly equal number of children now housed in rented rooms. But, fortunately for Chicago, her Board of Education does not have to cope with this tremendous problem with the feeble means that are at the disposal of too many other cities. They are not dependent on councils for school funds in Chicago, but have been empowered by the legislature to make a five-per-cent levy on real estate in the city, two-fifths of which may be used for salaries, and three-fifths for building purposes,—"a sum amply sufficient to provide wholesome and comfortable accommodation for every child of school age in the city." The advantage of a fixed school tax on real estate is, that the increase in the value of real property is in direct ratio with the increase in population, so that the School Board always has adequate means to meet additional demands without having to appeal for funds to an ignorant city council. It is to be hoped that such a tax will be introduced into cities like Brooklyn and Boston. In Chicago, during the year ending June, 1895, no fewer than 16 new school buildings were opened and 21 begun (14 since January, 1895), and it was thought that before December 6 or 8 more buildings would be in process of construction; while for the year 1896 the magnificent sum of $2,660,000 has been assigned for ground and buildings, with which it is expected that from 20 to 25 well-built and commodious school-houses will be erected. In addition to this all the school buildings in the city are reported to be in thoroughly good condition.

The energy and liberality with which difficulties are met in Chicago give us a gratifying instance of what Western business ability can accomplish when well directed, and we are confident that the 17,545

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children who are now attending in half-day divisions will soon be properly accommodated. They have the right spirit in Chicago, and feel that "nothing should be left undone which modern science can suggest, or money secure, to make ample provision for the temperature, light, ventilation, and sanitation of our school buildings. Anything short of the best is without excuse; for, when it is considered that the schools are the abiding-places of our children for so large a part of each day and year, it is little less than criminal to neglect these provisions so essential to their welfare." Would that there were more cities where such manly and liberal sentiments were the spirit of the community.

That the city councils and not the school authorities are responsible for most of the defects of our school system I have already intimated; but I have never seen the responsibility for parsimonious appropriations more forcibly put where it belongs than in the following extract from the report of the President of the Board of Education of Omaha, Nebraska, for June, 1894:—

"The condition of our treasury is such as to occasion grave concern. We have been able to continue the schools during the year without interruption, but end the fiscal year with a deficit. This condition is not owing in any degree to extravagance or mismanagement on the part of the Board, but wholly to the refusal of the City Council to do its plain duty in the matter of levying such a tax as it has been advised by the Board of Education was necessary to support the schools.

"For example, for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1894, the City Council came $33,580 short of providing the amount of money which it was informed would be required to carry on the schools for the year. It had the presumption, without warrant of law, and without any adequate knowledge of the situation, to arbitrarily reduce the amount asked for by that amount, without knowing or appearing to care whether the sum actually provided would enable us to keep the 16,000 children of this district in school or not; for the Council has nothing whatever to do with the schools, and knows nothing of their condition or needs. In fact, I venture the assertion that not a member of that body could have told at the time such action was taken, even approximately, the number of children enrolled, or even the number of schools in operation. Moreover, it is clearly the duty of the City Council, under the Constitution and laws of the State, to raise for the support of the schools such an amount of money as the Board of Education deems necessary.

"The time has come for plain speaking, and while we do not desire any controversy with that branch of the city government, it is only just that the citizens of this city should be advised of the facts; and should this unwarranted policy be continued by the Council until our schools are crippled, the responsibility should be laid—where it justly belongs—at the door of the City Council."

There is altogether too much anxiety to guard against possible extravagance on the part of our boards of education. We cannot hope

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to introduce effective municipal reforms until our citizens are educated up to them; and while false economy cramps and impedes the public schools, as the foregoing examples and many others that might be cited show that it is doing, the progress of the entire state is retarded. Let the educated and public-spirited men and women of the community be brought as a class into close contact with the public schools, and it will then become apparent that there is no investment which can be made that pays for itself so many times over as the money honestly spent for school purposes.

Finally I would suggest, in view of the great diversity of opinion that exists with regard to the facts that should be embodied in a superintendent's report, that the National Association of Superintendents might very properly consider at an early session what subjects should enter into the construction of the ideal report, and how such a report may be made most useful to the community.

JAMES HOSMER PENNIMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCULPTURE IN AMERICA.

"No matter what its possibilities may be, no matter what seeds of thought or virtue, what germs of genius or of art, lie latent in its breast, until the appropriate environment presents itself the correspondence is denied, the development discouraged, the most splendid possibilities of life remain unrealized, and thought and virtue, genius and art, are dead."

So writes Henry Drummond in his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and every earnest thinker must agree with him. In this country we are inclined to force our arts as we do exotics, in the atmosphere of the hothouse,—or to attempt to do so. At first this process may seem plausible and possible, but on second thought the serious man or serious people will discover that an art can only be as the life of the individual or nation that creates it. Art is not invention, but evolution. In considering, therefore, the development of art in America, we must first of all consider the environment; we must ascertain what are the conditions that have produced great art in the past, and, comparing such conditions with those under which we live, we shall soon be able to find what place the American people hold in the world of art, and what outlook is before us for a great and lasting school of sculpture.

In reviewing the history of those nations which have produced noble works in the field of sculpture, one very quickly finds that a great development in this art has come only with a serious and fervid patriotism: countries whose patriotism has been tame and vacillating have produced no great works of sculpture. Coleridge emphasizes this thought when he says of the Greeks:—

"Reflect a moment on the history of this wonderful people. What were they while they remained free and independent,—when Greece resembled a collection of mirrors set in a single frame, each having its own focus of patriotism, yet all capable, as at Marathon and Platea, of verging to one point and of consuming a common foe? What were they then? The fountains of light and civilization, of truth and of beauty, to all mankind. . . . They lost their independence—and with their independence their patriotism—and became the cosmopolites of antiquity. . . . While they were intense patriots they were the benefactors of all mankind."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But that intense patriotism once broken in upon and diluted with the aggressive and material life of the Roman, their arts begin to disintegrate. The sublime nude figures of Phidias fell to a state of mere sensual loveliness under Praxiteles, and soon to a much lower condition.

In this essay we must frequently refer to Greece, not only because she has taken a supreme position in the art of sculpture, but because our own state and commonwealth is more like the state under which the arts flourished in Greece than any other nation since their time. And it is a curious fact that our early sculptors produced works not unlike the crude sculptures of Greece, antedating the age of Phidias, which have lately been discovered near the Parthenon in Athens. The student of the beginnings of American sculpture will note that, while the works are crude in execution, they are characterized by a loftiness of thought akin to that spoken of above as characterizing the pre-Phidian sculptors. The faith that brought the Puritan to this shore and enabled him to remain notwithstanding the rigor of the climate and the hostility of the savage, showed itself in our art beginnings as an inevitable result. It was only when men went abroad and studied the arts of other nations that we began to produce pseudo-classical works. It is a very serious question whether our art has been greatly benefited by the sending abroad of so many students to be developed under foreign influences. It would have been well for us, I believe, if we had imported drawing-masters and men who could have taught us the dexterous manipulation of clay, and ourselves remained in our own country, developing an art which is an integral part of the life of the people. I realize that in saying this I am making a bold statement, yet I believe it to be true. Many critics will say that, had we waited for art to come to us, we should have been a century behind our present status, but philosophy and history do not justify such a theory.

When a nation rises to a point where it has a serious life and sufficient patriotism to find enduring expression in form, sculptors have invariably arisen to carve its ideals in marble and to cast them in enduring bronze. How did we produce in this country such men as Emerson, Hawthorne, and Whittier, to say nothing of men like Lincoln, Grant, and Sumner? Certainly not by an order of foreign study, or by subjecting these men, when young, to the influence of foreign nations. What is true of literature and statesmanship must be true of art. There is in our people a certain simplicity of purpose, honesty of endeavor, and nobility, which would have found expression in sculpture had Europe sunk beneath the seas. In the development of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art, names count for very little, and one or two of the men whose names are now constantly before the public will have to take a second place when the history of American sculpture is written. Work may be brilliant without having the racial instinct or quality which lifts it above the imitation of the foreign model.

Since writing the above paragraphs regarding the development of art upon the native soil, I have found in an essay of Ruskin's an opinion which tallies precisely with this thought, and which I am glad to quote as the verdict of a critic who ranks among the first, if he is not the very first, in our tongue. Speaking of the Athenian and Florentine schools of art, he says that both are of equal rank—

—"as essentially original and independent: the Florentine, being subsequent to the Greek, borrowed much from it; but it would have existed just as strongly, and perhaps in some respects more nobly, had it been the first instead of the latter of the two. . . . The Greeks found Phœnician and Etruscan art monstrous, and had to make them human. The Italians found Byzantine and Norman art monstrous, and had to make them human. . . . But we mistake in supposing that Athens taught Florence the laws of design; she taught her, in reality, only the duty of truth."

This duty *we* never had to learn from Europe, thanks to the Puritan.

The same task and problem were set before the American as before the Athenian and the Florentine; the crude art of the Mound-builder, the Mexican, and the Indian was to be softened, humanized, and uplifted to the sphere of civilized and cultured living. And it is curious to note that the Florentine in his time made the same mistake as that into which many of our earlier sculptors fell,—that of copying new-found classical sculpture, and setting aside all present inspiration and models. There are two chief dangers which threaten the art of sculpture in America. The one has been a tendency to copy foreign models, Greek, Florentine, and French: this we may call Charybdis. The other danger, which we may designate the Scylla of American art, is that which follows the opposite swing of the pendulum, and which threatens whenever an age is characterized by commercial and mechanical activity, absorbing the interest of the people to the detriment of higher pursuits; when it is forgotten that sculpture, especially monumental sculpture, deals with the ideal and the symbolic, and that it is the spirit and the entirety of a life and an age, rather than its accidents of clothing and feature, that are to be embodied.

In an essay upon the development of the art of sculpture in America, it would be of little or no use to give an exact catalogue of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the men who have carried it forward or pursued it as a mere means of livelihood, without abetting or hindering its progress. A few names will suffice to tell of those whose lives and work have contributed to American sculpture. This art has with us, for the most part, followed a normal and natural order of development; that is, it has come only after the necessities of life have been provided for, and some time after the love of painting had been developed. Considerable interest and not a little talent had been manifested in architecture before the word "sculpture" came into vogue. The fact that marble is expensive and has to be brought from Italy accounts partially for the lack of sculpture in this country; but we must account further for this lack by thoroughly understanding the conditions in life which engender and develop a love for art and pure form. Such conditions have not long existed in America. That they do exist to a certain extent to-day, however, I will attempt to demonstrate.

As early as the year 1784 we find mention of a Mrs. Patience Wright, born in Bordentown, N. J., in 1725, who achieved some success as a sculptor at home and in England. In the latter country she made likenesses of the King and Queen, of Lord Chatham, and others; and a year before her death in 1785 we find mention of a life-sized wax statue of Lord Chatham executed by her, and standing in a glass case in Westminster Abbey. When we consider the unfortunate accident of her birth in an environment and atmosphere not tempered to the artist, and when we remember that her instruction must have been of the most meagre nature, we must not only admire and pity her, but must also accord her a place of honor among the pioneers of American art. Mr. Adams, the American Minister to the Court of St. James, in an interesting paragraph describes a visit to Mrs. Wright in London. At this early date we had already a number of famous painters, such as West, Trumbull, and Stuart, while Mrs. Wright seems to have been the only American who had achieved a reputation in the almost despised art of sculpture.

The arrival of Houdon in 1785, persuaded by Jefferson and Franklin to come from France to this country to make a statue of Washington for the State House at Richmond, marked an era for such lovers of art as then existed in America. Mr. Madison tells us that Houdon modelled the head of Washington directly from life at Mount Vernon, and he was himself present at many of the sittings. From this excellent portrait bust, which is still in existence, and from the noble painting of his head by Stuart, we may form a just conception of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington's appearance. Houdon's bust is almost as common in France as in America; and although not so magnanimous a representation as the head executed by our own sculptor, Crawford, we must be very grateful to Houdon for having faithfully recorded the features of our first President. The visit of this French artist had the beneficial effect of awakening society to a desire to become more familiar with and to own good works of sculpture.

In 1789, four years after the death of Mrs. Patience Wright, there came to America a certain John Dixey, who practised ornamental stone-cutting and wood-carving. He was a man of some ability, for in 1810 we find his name mentioned as the vice-president of the new Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia.

William Rush, who was born in Philadelphia in 1757, and who died in 1833, achieved distinction as a modeller and as a wood-carver, but his chief contribution to American art was the interest he exhibited in the plan for the Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia.

In 1791, Ceracchi, well known in England and France, arrived in this country. He seems to have had a heartfelt desire to build a great national monument, but it is hardly necessary to say that Congress failed to appropriate the needed funds when called upon to do so. He threw himself heartily into the scheme for the establishment of the Academy of Fine Arts. While in America Ceracchi executed busts of a number of famous men, notably portraits of Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Paul Jones, and John Jay. He remained here but four years, but worked with an industry which must have acted as a stimulus to all people interested in fine arts. His work is not great, and smacks of the pseudo-classical school of Canova, but we must thank him for handing down to us portraits of some of the greatest men this country has produced.

In the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington is a bas-relief signed by N. Genvelot, and executed in 1827. The subject is that of Penn making his famous treaty with the Indians. It seems impossible to find any history of this sculptor or his other works. In the same place is another bas-relief signed by A. Capellano, and executed in the same year. The theme here presented is Pocahontas saving Captain Smith. Other traces have been found of this sculptor's works, but of little or no artistic value. It is rather a sad comment on our present school of sculpture to note that these early artists—American or foreign—had the good sense to execute subjects from our own picturesque history, and were not obliged to ransack Greek mythology for suggestions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it also speaks volumes for that fraction of the community who desired their own history represented, and believed that its heroes were worthy of such perpetuation.

We now reach a name of much interest, because its bearer was the first American sculptor who was educated and pursued his art in this country. John Frasee was born in Rahway, N. J., and he learned the trade of a stone-cutter. The first statues he ever saw were in the New York Academy of Fine Arts in 1820, and these casts were a gift from Napoleon. It is pathetically recorded that his first original bust was made from his own dead child, and this work had sufficient merit to bring about an introduction to Trumbull, the president of the Academy, who has put himself on ignominious record by saying that "nothing in sculpture would be wanted in this country for a hundred years,"—to which Frasee made the worthy reply: "Is such a man fit for a president of an academy of fine arts?" Historically it is important to note that John Frasee made the first portrait bust attributed to an American, and executed after the death of the subject,—John Wells. Among Frasee's sitters we note Daniel Webster, Judges Story and Westcott, and Chief Justice Marshall.

An appreciation of sculpture in the early part of the present century was a rare instinct. We find the clear-headed John Adams writing in 1818 to a French sculptor, M. Binon, who wished to make his portrait:—

"The age of sculpture and painting has not yet arrived in this country, and I hope it will be long before it does. I would not give sixpence for a painting by Raphael or a statue by Phidias."

Still we find him later inviting the same artist to become his guest at Quincy, and permitting him to make a plaster cast of his face, and, moreover, according him numerous sittings. This bust may be seen in Faneuil Hall, Boston, to this day.

Names now begin to multiply. Horatio Greenough and Hiram Powers were born in the same year,—1805. Greenough was a man of scholarly attainments and artistic instincts, and a man of undoubted power and tireless energy. To him belongs the credit of being the first American to execute a group in marble,—the "Chanting Cherubs." It is interesting to note that Fenimore Cooper gave him the commission.

The name of Hiram Powers must ever bear a certain dignity, and he is one of the men who has placed sculpture before the public without leaving any deep impress upon it as an art. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adulation once bestowed upon the "Greek Slave" led some critic to write the following lines:—

> "Some pent glow, methinks, diffuses o'er those limbs a grace of soul
> Warm with nature and yet chastened by a holy self-control,
> Teaching how the loyal spirit ne'er can feel an outward chain,
> While its truth remains unconquered, and the will asserts her reign."

His "Eve" is a most lovely original, and looks "like nature in the world's first spring." She is holding the apple, and her face expresses thought and curiosity, mixed with a presentiment of future ill. We must believe that Powers was more of a man than we now can think him from the work he has left us, for we find John Quincy Adams writing to Powers, after that sculptor had made a successful bust of him, the following sonnet, which is certainly worth quoting as a comment upon the life of this statesman which cannot fail to interest all Americans:—

> "Sculptor! thy hand hath moulded into form
> The haggard features of a time-worn face;
> And whosoever views thy work shall trace
> An age of sorrow and a life of storm!
> And canst thou model the heart? For that is warm,
> Glowing with tenderness for all its race;
> Instinct with all the sympathies that grace
> Those pure and artless bosoms where they swarm!
> Artist! may fortune smile upon thy hand!
> Go forth, and rival Greece's art sublime;
> Return, and bid the statesmen of thy land
> Live in thy marble through all aftertime!
> Oh, snatch from heaven the fire Prometheus stole,
> And give the sculptured block a living soul!"

We must not forget Joel T. Hart, born in Kentucky in 1810, and who passed much of his life in Florence. He modelled a statue of Henry Clay, which is now in Louisville, and invented a clever machine by which the tedious labor of transferring the model or original to marble has been considerably diminished. He seems to have made a careful study of the human form.

Next comes Thomas Crawford, who has become famous, not only for his own excellent work, but for the rare affection he inspired in the nature of Charles Sumner. It was Charles Sumner who made him famous. He found him in Rome, poor, unknown, and discouraged, and encouraged him by saying that some day he would inhabit one of the palaces of that city, which prophecy was eventually realized. A figure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of an Indian chief, part of the group in the pediment in the Capitol at Washington, was so admired by the English sculptor, Gibson, that he wished to have it cast in bronze and set up as a monument to Crawford in Rome. We cannot but lament the untimely death of this genius, which took place in London in 1857. His friend and companion, Randolph Rogers, completed his unfinished work. Had he lived he would undoubtedly have produced great and original work, for such specimens as we have left to us display the workings of a mind original, vigorous, and artistic.

Nor should we omit the names of Henry Kirke Brown, born in Leyden, Mass., in 1814; Henry Dexter, born in New York State in 1806; and Erastus D. Palmer, also of New York, born in 1817. These men exhibited positive talent if not genius; they cherished high ideals and worked hard and conscientiously. Alas, that the times were not great enough for them to achieve the greatest results!

We now mention two men who have become widely known in this country and in Europe for the versatility of their gifts, their large culture, and, in some respects, brilliant achievements,—Thomas Ball, born in Massachusetts in 1819, and still living in Florence, Italy, and W. W. Story. It was Ball who executed the noble equestrian statue of Washington in the Public Garden, Boston, which has won for its author enduring fame, and which must be classed among the great equestrian statues of the world. In this statue, executed while Mr. Ball was still a young man, we see the effect of the intellectual surroundings in which he was born and educated; we see Emerson and Webster and Sumner, and the days when intellectual giants walked about the streets of Boston.

The name of William Wetmore Story—a son of an illustrious father (Chief-Justice Story), and a graduate of Harvard University—marks an era when men of refined birth (which the Greeks thought the highest good and greatest possible blessing) and liberal education entered the field of fine arts. His work in sculpture displays study, refinement, and elegance, rather than spontaneity, and that order of artistic comprehension which genius alone can give to the dull clay. Mr. Story also won fame for himself in the field of literature.

Two men who more than all others have influenced the art of sculpture in this country up to the present date are, John Rogers, born in Salem, Mass., in 1829, and J. Q. A. Ward, born in Ohio in 1830. Mr. Rogers has done more than any other living being to popularize the art of sculpture among us. When his work became known, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cheap casts of the insipid figures of Canova and his school became less common. A number of his groups, especially those in which he represents homely scenes of New England life, and the stress and storm of the days that tried men's souls, exhibit a decided and acknowledged artistic merit. One sculptor has said that he has handled the ugly costume of the modern man better than any other living sculptor. His portrait groups of Joseph Jefferson as *Rip Van Winkle* will make Jefferson, Washington Irving, and himself immortal.

Randolph Rogers, who was born in 1825, executed the bronze doors of the Capitol at Washington, which are especially interesting because they represent scenes from the life of Columbus, and point to the depiction of American scenes rather than to the imitation of foreign models. At the present day we hear the names of St. Gaudens, Daniel French, and Olin Warner mentioned on every side, but we are too near these men to judge of their influence upon American art and to what extent they have drawn from foreign models.

To return to the conditions which produce great art. Sculpture comes last in the history of a people's development and culture. We can thus account for its tardiness with us, if such a criticism is made upon the American people. We are too young yet for the ripest achievements in the fine arts. To those who would take heaven by storm, we must cry, Patience! To those who claim that there is no reason for expecting the highest expression in sculpture from this hurrying people, we must reply, You do not understand them! And to those who would create and foster a love for the highest in the fine arts, but are paralyzed by the unhappy superficial aspects of modern life, we must commend everlasting patience, constant faith, and a looking back to the men who have framed this Constitution and made this Republic an enduring fact.

History shows that any people who have made themselves free and independent, and sustained that freedom courageously and constantly, have found expression sooner or later for the embodiment of the ideals of freedom. Sculpture is not only the last note in the people's development, but it is also the loftiest condition to which the individual can rise. It implies the subordination of the material and sensual aspects of life, and an order of self-surrender and discipline which but few fully realize. Yet while few rise to a complete understanding of this supreme art, there is a multitude who love, appreciate, and worship it from a distance. I do not know that we can ask more than this order of appreciation from the people. We do not demand it in other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arts, and I doubt if we have any right to ask it for sculpture. The most sincere and truest test of our love for it as a people will be the same as the test we may apply to the individual and his love for it. And this is simply its meaning or import to us. If it is a saving and inspiring grace to the beggar who kneels upon the stone floor of the cathedral before the face of a Madonna glorified with human sympathy, and who goes out from that holy atmosphere with a new life begun and the best in him drawn out, it is surely more to him than it can be to the man who cares simply for the display in his gallery of copies of all the masterpieces his money can purchase. The question then arises, How are we to educate this people to an appreciation of this great and simple art?

The first practical way which suggests itself is by making art-education in the public schools a part of the study, and as compulsory as word and cipher languages. Only a few years have passed since art-education in this country was a privilege of the rich. Now no academy in the land is considered well equipped which has not a certain course in the fine arts,—too often elected, we regret to say, as an escape from more earnest study rather than for the love of beautiful things. But even this aspect is changing, and the new men are learning to care for—to understand—the great masterpieces of the world because they afford an order of enjoyment and growth which mathematics and athletics do not furnish. We must endeavor to make art-education a genuine thing, a living force, and not in any sense an affectation,—not merely a pretty thing to appear in a catalogue. We must not place it in the hands of men to whom all art is over with Titian and Tintoret, who walk about the college campus and the schoolroom with long faces, as if art were a difficult thing to understand or was buried in a long-forgotten past. These men are Philistines, and we must weed them out and place in their stead men of present patriotism and living sympathy,—men who love their fellow kind sufficiently to desire to reveal to them the divine inspirations and compensations that come from an appreciation of art. There are such men in this country, and they are finding their way into the right places, for which we cannot be too thankful. We must lift art out of the abstract and make it a personal matter. We must encourage it, and, to be practical, we must purchase it. We cannot all buy marbles and costly bronzes, but there is not one of us who cannot afford to have a photograph of some masterpiece, or a plaster cast of some lofty work of sculpture. We stint ourselves to purchase a ticket for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opera, and many men would go without other luxuries to possess a book. Well and good! Now let us push on to that state of culture in which we are willing to deny ourselves something that we may possess a picture or cast which often furnishes a higher order of enjoyment than does the opera or the novel.

Art-education in the public schools is the surest and simplest way of bringing this people to that state of development where they can appreciate great art and what it holds for them. Year after year brings us evidence of the artistic genius of this people. It is needful that we should draw out wisely and with discretion this artistic inclination and precious instinct, and that we should encourage it, not only by the generous endowment of scholarships, but by personal sympathy whenever and wherever such genius comes to our notice. Only such discernment and sympathy can beget great art for this people. And only in this way, on the other hand, may we become a highly civilized people. It is a contradiction in terms to imagine a high state of civilization without a great existing art. As I have said before, the conditions when great art may be possible for us depend not only upon effort, but upon time. Art never comes as did Minerva, fully armed.

A great art for America naturally implies a wide knowledge and reverence for the art efforts of the nations which have preceded our own. This is not incompatible with the intensest patriotism. We have, in reality, more to learn from the nations which now exist only through their art products, than from contemporary peoples. If we study contemporaneous art too closely, we find ourselves desiring to copy it, or unconsciously doing so. As an instance of this, note the tendency of our painters and sculptors to copy French art and to adopt its principles and ideas, and with what pernicious effect upon our own advancement and our faith in the ideals of our ancestors! A great art, then, implies experience and a knowledge of the world's history. Some critics have claimed that our topographical isolation is a detriment to our advancement in fine art. This is surely a mistake. That very isolation has enabled us to maintain our freedom unmolested, and to carry on an order of government which has endured longer than any known republic. It has produced great types of manhood, and it is an absurdity to assume that, having accomplished so much, these conditions should suddenly fail us when we demand of them a great art to embody the ideals of loftiest manhood. It is fairer to assume that our art has suffered, as well as our morality, by contact with a nation like the French, whose moral sense, to say the least, is confused.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certain causes have, however, interfered with our producing great art thus far. In sculpture it has been chiefly the lack of sufficient time and culture for its normal development. The country is so vast that a large portion of the population is still given over to conquering the forces of nature. As I have mentioned the word "morality" in connection with our people, and the lack of it in the modern expression of art by the French, let me dwell a moment on this way of thinking, for which so many men are called Philistines by the very ones who are themselves the most pronounced Philistines because they do not realize that they are such. If one had suggested to the clear-eyed Greek that a great art might exist without a great and true standard of morality, he would have relegated the speaker to the shades. I use the word "morality" in its broadest sense; I use it simply to imply all that means cosmos out of chaos; and when I say that we need time to round out this nation so that it may produce great work in the fine arts, I consider it essential to know what is fine before we can produce it.

Many will ask how we are to know if a work of sculpture is good or bad art. The simplest way that suggests itself is to ask one's self if the work is true to nature. And this surely is a good rule and a happy way of proceeding. But we must be sure that we have an adequate idea of the highest aspects of nature. It would never be fair, for instance, for a man who had never seen the beautiful sculpture of the Greeks, or their casts in the museums, or who had never studied the more wonderful forms of his own people, to venture to say that a statue is not good art because it is not true to some distorted idea of nature which he holds in his imagination. We must be careful, then, that we understand the highest aspects of nature as well as the lowest. No man who has passed his life entirely in the streets of London or New York can be a fair judge of a picture by Turner or George Inness. We must use our common sense in this respect, as we do in the common walks of life. We must hold the mirror up to nature, and be careful that our eyes do not look through an inverted or distorted lens. Nature assumes myriad forms and aspects.

We are driven back fairly upon the idea I have before advanced, that the art which a man or nation produces depends upon the order of man who creates it. We cannot get away from this fact. We must, then, not only study art for the people, and see that the children in the public schools are educated, but we must demand that our artists be properly trained and educated, so that they may reflect the noble rather than the ignoble aspects of their time and surroundings. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must demand that our artists first of all be educated in an environment that produces great men, no matter if that environment be a conventional one or not. We must demand that they be imbued thoroughly with reverence for the great men who have gone before them. We would not permit a man to enter the pulpit and preach those things that are immoral and destructive to the individual as well as to the nation, and why should we permit the artist to do so? We will not allow our historians to falsify the records of this people and its struggles, fostering lower ideas of life and belittling our manhood, and yet we often permit the artist who is writing indestructible history in stone to do so. If the American people will use in the fine arts the common sense with which they are generously endowed, and which they apply to many other aspects of life, great art will be inevitable.

Men of science teach us that nothing can be evolved that is not involved, and that energy cannot be destroyed,—it can only be transferred. Surely there is no nobler way to change our vital energies than by transferring them to beautiful and lovely forms which must pass on and inspire generations yet to come. Perhaps it will be wise to show the people that art-education in the public schools is a matter of political economy. France affords abundant means for artistic study and inspiration, because she finds it to her profit to do so. Thousands of visitors are attracted to her gay capital by the alluring charms of an art atmosphere. Not only do our students carry large sums of money to Paris, but France yearly sells her millions of dollars' worth of art products to Americans. She has found it the truest political economy to establish great museums, where fine-art products are preserved and exhibited, such as the Louvre and the Luxembourg and the Cluny Museum. These institutions are thronged on holidays and Sundays by the working-people, and thus, by presenting fine art to the common people, she educates them. In each quarter of the city one may find schools where these arts are taught, and there are numerous day and night schools subsidized by the government, where both sexes may learn gratis, or at little cost, the arts of design. The one thing that has done more than all else to raise the standard of instruction in France was the report of the jury of the Exposition of Schools in Paris, which affirmed that "the study of linear drawing based upon geometry ought to be the foundation of the programme of all academic and industrial schools."

In 1869 a Congress of Art was held in Paris which emphatically declared the same principle, and furthermore insisted upon "suppressing the print, and founding the first studies in drawing upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elements of geometry." This principle has been followed in France since 1865. In technical art education, France, Belgium, Prussia, Switzerland, and Austria have been, until late years, far in advance of Great Britain; and only in a few instances has the United States been able in any measure to compete with England in this respect, and only in articles of coarse manufacture, such as spades, shovels, axes, etc.: rarely, if ever, in those articles of commerce to which taste and finish give an enhanced value. England soon found it necessary to establish schools of design, museums, and libraries in order to compete at all with France and Prussia. The Kensington Museum has done the greatest good to English art and art products, and has established a training-school from which hundreds of teachers have gone forth over the whole kingdom. The work at Kensington has been carried forward with the same thoroughness that the English people show in all branches of government work. In the official directory may be found, in the regulations for promoting instruction in art, four separate orders of schools,—elementary schools, training-colleges for teachers, art night classes, and schools of art. I mention these facts, which may seem a little apart from the subject, because I believe they will be useful to us in the forming of like schools.

It is a crucial time with the American people and their fine arts; and it behooves the public to demand great art of the sculptor, and not to accept that which is commonplace or meretricious. It should refuse that which is mere photographic reproduction, and that order of sculpture which belongs to the maker of plaster casts. It must demand of its artists a high order—and, above all things, a sane order—of living. There is no reason why the public should tolerate eccentric and ignoble living from the sculptor and painter, any more than from the author, or, in fact, from any man. It must compel its artists to be great. It is not too much to demand of the artist of to-day that his life be as thoughtful, high-toned, and generous as the lives of Raphael, Angelo, and Leonardo da Vinci. Even the standard of Emerson is not too lofty for a man who is to embody a people's highest ideals:—

"If we live truly, we shall see truly. It is as easy for the strong man to be strong as it is for the weak to be weak. . . . When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn. . . . If anybody will tell me whom the great man imitates in the original crisis when he performs a great act, I will tell him who else than himself can teach him. Shakspeare will never be made by the study of Shakspeare. Do that which is assigned thee, and thou canst not hope too much or dare too much."

What did Michael Angelo learn from schools and masters? Not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than he learned from the cloud-forms and the effects of the moonlight falling through the branches of the rugged stone-pine. Never will one become a great sculptor by shutting himself within the four walls of a studio, thus barring out the letters that go to make up the alphabet of beautiful art. But these cloud-forms and this moonlight we must not attempt to measure with the compass or to fix with the camera. If we try to do this we shall have the same result that comes when we hold a dead bird in the hand, its song and movement ended. These effects should become so much a part of the artist that he puts them into his work unconsciously, and they in turn uplift the public with a measure of the same inspiration by which he has been moved. So an artist, to be great, must be true. He must not borrow his glories,—he must own them.

What should a sculptor himself be, in his life and training, in order to do enduring work? Let us glance again for a moment at the only people of the world who have done really great work in monumental sculpture,—the Greeks. The French, even, are not excepted; for, when all is known, they are at their best only clever,—rarely great. The Athenian republic was not unlike our own in point of civilization and literary achievement. But it was unlike our own in one vital aspect. The artist was a rounded man, and not a one-sided creature. Why was Phidias great? Because of Pericles. Why was the age of Pericles great? Because of Phidias. The weakness is thus traced from the art to the artist; from the artist to his world, which will not recognize that essentially artistic work can be done only by a man so educated, environed, and manually trained as to conceive great thoughts and execute them. He should be able to compare notes with educated men in the different professions and arts, thereby obtaining the attrition necessary to a proper rounding of thought.

We must, then, forever do away with the thought that art can be invented or borrowed. Not only must the artist be taught to appreciate the limitations of his art, but the people must be made sensible of the respective arts and their limitations,—that is, they must not expect sculpture to represent scenes that do not lend themselves to the severity of this art, but are more suitable to the painter. Then, too, the artist must not permit the advertising craze to attach itself to him, or even to his dealer; and let him remember, when he exhibits his work, that he is appealing to the lowliest, who may have as sincere an appreciation as the most cultured. Joseph Jefferson says that he endeavors to remember that he is playing to the man who has paid his shilling to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sit in the pit, equally with the man who sits in the orchestra stall. Then we must sell our paintings and statues only to those who really care for them. To sell a painting to a man who does not care for it is a degradation of one's art,—one might almost say a prostitution of one's highest. And the people must grasp, once and forever, the fact that great art is always popular art; that is, only that art has become great in the world which has received the final approbation of the people.

Brother artists, open wide your souls and let the beauty of the world fall upon them! Then will you give back that order of art which makes the Gothic period in architecture supremely beautiful,—the period when men lived by faith as well as by works. You will take into yourself the divine inspiration that awaits you at every turn in the world of nature and of men, and give it back to the world in forms of beauty and truth, making life on earth only a little short of the life of heaven. We must not look alone for the nymphs of Greek mythology in our streams and woodlands, but find deeper and richer suggestions. The only escape and safety for the artist is in letting his brain work with his feeling, cultivating his intelligence to a point where he will not be carried off his feet by every change of sentiment.

And what shall be the result of the development of sculpture for America? What shall it make of us? It must not be less lovely than the art of Greece, but more so. For we shall have breathed into it the spirit of a new life. This new art will owe much to those that have gone, and acknowledge it frankly and gratefully. It shall be an art in which buffoonery plays no part. Harlequin will find no place upon its stage. How shall we know this art of the future? First of all, by its uplifting power, as we know and believe in nature, and love to keep in tune with her. What shall be its chief characteristic, to distinguish it from all others? Character,—in the Christian sense. Our conception of nature must tally with the wide knowledge we have gleaned of the universe and the men who inhabit it. If we do not see in nature more than the Greek found there, it is surely our fault, and the doors of the heart and soul are closed to the revelations of the hour. "Dwell up there in the simple and noble regions of thy life, obey thy heart, and thou shalt reproduce the foreworld again."

WILLIAM ORDWAY PARTRIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A STUDY OF CHURCH ENTERTAINMENTS.

I AM in receipt of an attractively printed advertisement of a "Fair." It is issued by a group of ladies and gentlemen who are pleased to denominate themselves a "Church." The card is a programme of ingenious devices for obtaining money under false pretences; it is inscribed with an italic sentiment intended to set forth the spirit of the affair,—a sentiment eminently delicate and proper, though not out of the body of writing supposed to be venerated by churches; out of "Two Gentlemen of Verona," if I recognize it:—

"*'Tis an honorable kind of thievery.*"

I call this delicate and appropriate; I may also say it is admirable for its candor. It is the robust candor of the clergyman who, in his speech opening a similar church Bazaar, said:—

"They come to be cheated [*laughter and applause*], and if they don't come to be cheated a little, they deserve to be cheated a good deal" [*renewed applause*].

It will not be well to take this too seriously, and to wax with the indignation that will rise in the bosoms of some old-fashioned honest folk who still cherish the notion that Christ's Church should ever promote holy living and a serious and dignified morality. Let us have our laugh over its naïve immorality, almost saved from itself by confessing to itself; but *then* let us think a moment what it means that such a confession can be made thus easily, jocularly,—that is, can be made without horror,—by a Christian Church! The confession can be made so calmly because it is a confession to what everybody knows and is known to know. It is a matter of common knowledge that churches have methods of raising money which are fraudulent, and nobody is horrified by the knowledge, because nobody to-day takes the churches any more seriously than they take themselves.

It is indeed difficult for the imagination to connect these modern societies, occupied in giving fairs, suppers, and popular entertainments, with the undivided Church which once worshipped God in simplicity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and seriousness, filled with heavenly aspirations. Modern religious methods do not find their patterns in the earlier Church. We are not informed, I ventured to submit to the last Church Congress in the United States, that the Church at Ephesus or Philippi ever advertised a bazaar, a clam-bake, or a strawberry-sociable. We have no information that St. Paul was accustomed to give stereopticon lectures, Barnabas operating the lantern. It is not clearly established that St. Athanasius ever arranged a kirmess, a broom-drill, or a pink tea. There seems, then, to be no inherent necessity for the Church to undertake the amusement of the public. Our Lord knew, I conceive, what the nineteenth century would need at the hands of His Church; but He left it no direction, explicit or implicit, to open eating-houses and theatres. He seems to have been entirely ignorant of any time to come when it would be best for His blood-bought Church to transform itself into a system of concert-halls, kitchens, and entertainment-bureaus.

The necessity under which it has done so is not one inherent in its character, but one forced upon it by conditions which are the result of divisions in the Church; it is sectarianism which has made the religious show a necessity. Does any one claim that churches have awakened to a better understanding of their function than the Founder and the Apostles had? No one claims it. Is it pretended that sacred negro minstrels, dances, light opera, and vaudeville are to-day more essential to the salvation of men than prayer, worship, the reading of the Scriptures, and the administration of the Sacraments? It is not pretended. The plain fact is that the luxury of having one hundred and forty sects is expensive, and the money to pay for it has to be raised in some fashion. In communities where one Catholic Church would be gladly and fully supported by the voluntary offerings of the community, half a dozen denominations cannot gain a support without going into business and baiting the public with fairs and theatricals.

I do not undertake to say that our unhappy divisions are entirely responsible for the commercialization of religion. Shows and fairs are not unknown in lands where there is practically but one Church. But nowhere else do they attain anything like the vogue they have in the United States. Nowhere else do they approach ours in frequency and sensationalism. And it is as undeniable that here they are engaged in, nine cases out of ten, because of the necessity of obtaining funds, as it is undeniable that that necessity arises from the partition of the contributions of Christians among the various sects, instead of their application to the maintenance of one Church. The chances are that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minister who made the humorous speech at the opening of his Bazaar was sick at heart when he made it. I have indulged my fancy in making a little sketch of the genesis of that Bazaar: it is entirely fanciful, but I venture to believe that, were the truth known, it would prove to be not unlike the description given in the next paragraph.

This minister came to his church spiritually eager to lead his new people into a higher life, and to persuade them to deeper devotion to their Master. Soon after his arrival, the Presbyterians, to offset the novelty of a new preacher at the other church, got up a Girls' Sewing-school. Whereupon the deacons urged the new minister to organize a Boys' Brigade. He did so, and ran in debt for the equipments. Then the Methodist Sunday-school gave a Picnic; whereupon the new minister felt constrained to put an orchestra into his Sunday-school. Presently there was discovered a leak in the roof; and the organ required tuning; and new books were needed; and there was a deficit in current accounts; and there was nothing for it but to devise some means of getting money out of people who had given all they thought they could, and other people who could not be asked to give at all. The Baptists had just had a War Concert; the Universalists a Lawn Fête; the Free-Will Baptists a Chocolate Drill; the Congregationalists a Mrs. Jarley's Wax-Works Show; the Unitarians a Fancy Dress Ball; the Swedenborgians a May-pole Frolic; the Episcopalians a *Café Chantant;* and the Zion Church a Cake-Walk. What was there left but a Bazaar?

Every one will see without argument that division of the contributions for the support of the Gospel not only makes church fairs and entertainments necessary, but also brings about the condition that these must constantly grow more sensational. If churches go into the business of entertaining the public, they must entertain it; when the public wants a new drill, they must supply it. After the Methodists have given a successful show, the Baptists, if they would be successful, must have something still more striking to advertise, and then the Congregationalists must beat the Baptists. I present a study of church entertainments, which may reveal something of the enormity of the evil which has grown up amid the conditions of ecclesiastical rivalry and competition which obtain in America.

From June 1, 1894, to June 1, 1895, I have kept a record of the events arranged by religious societies for raising money, which have come to my attention. My sources of information have been advertisements received by mail or observed in public places; press reports,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chiefly from half a dozen New England papers; and private intelligence sent or given by other clergymen. The record notes over two hundred occasions; these, of course, are but a fraction of those which have occurred, even in a limited district, but they may be regarded as fairly typical of what is going on in the country.

A scrutiny of my list gives some gratifying conclusions. I am glad to put them down. The lottery has almost disappeared from church entertainments. The Roman Catholics retain it; a favorite device with them being the making of "books" upon contributed articles,—a form of raffle. At one Roman Catholic fair barrels of beer were among the prizes. There has not come to my notice a single Congress of Beauty. The selling of kisses, with which some sections used to be familiar, has been entirely discountenanced by growing discernment of the proprieties. No Midway Plaisance has come to my notice this year. If I am not mistaken, I observe an effort to prevent interference with the hours of worship, though one thrifty Methodist society gave up its Thursday evening prayer-meeting in order to set a supper for a crowd in attendance upon the laying of a corner-stone near the church. It may be concluded, on the whole, that fairs have risen in character, and have become less frequent. Suppers remain the standard resort of religious societies in the smaller towns. These are quiet occasions, and afford an opportunity for kindly intercourse, which does much to excuse them.

Nothing could be more disheartening, however, than a review of the list of church entertainments proper,—public performances for money: these occupy most of the record. No attempt has been made to gather sensational items, but of those which have come to my attention more than half have features which make them sensational; some have features which must be declared indecent. These are not admitted among the specific examples which follow.

On the first page of my book is pasted a slip cut from the amusement-columns of the Boston "Herald." Here is a two-inch advertisement, spicily worded, announcing a performance at "The People's." Next to it, identical in make-up and display, is the announcement of a performance at "The Howard." "The People's," to judge from the advertisement, gave distinctly the livelier show. One is the most notorious variety-hall in Boston,—the Howard Athenæum; the other is the People's —— *Church!*

I have also preserved an advertisement of "Austin & Stone's,"—a resort of like character with "The Howard,"—which informs the public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a person named Kelly will give "the inimitable act, 'Casey at the Bat.'" I am not sure whether it was Kelly, or some other sketch-artist, who recently rendered the inimitable act, "Casey at the Bat," in the Methodist church in Middleboro, Massachusetts, for the benefit of the organ fund.

The same paper not long ago printed a column account of the notable success scored by the Church of the Epiphany at Winchester, Massachusetts, in its presentation of "The Mikado." "There was nothing heavy in the performance," we are informed; the Church of the Epiphany "succeeded in imparting a clever swing to the catchy solos and rollicking chorus that took the audience by storm." It seems that the Church of the Epiphany has not before attempted opera, having confined its religious work to the more conventional lines. "Winchester people were of the opinion till last evening that the minstrels of the Calumet Club, a local lot of fun-makers, could hardly be excelled in arranging a first-class home entertainment. Though the Calumets did wonderfully well in their chosen line in pleasing the public, the Church of the Epiphany" has beaten them. *Pish Tush*, by the leader of the Church of the Epiphany choir, was a most happy impersonation. *Nanki Poo*, in his cream tights, made life indescribably sunny for *Yum Yum*. *The Mikado* himself, a Calumet Club end-man, delighted all with his happy local hits. In short, as the account enthusiastically concludes, "the Church of the Epiphany, as the producer of light operatic diversion, has crowned itself with glory."

Had the rector of the Church of the Epiphany assembled his people in worship that evening, he would have had to lead them in a solemn prayer, the collect proper for the day, beseeching God to "grant unto all those who are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion that they may avoid those things that are contrary to their profession." He would also have read to them, as the Gospel-lesson, the immortal story of a poor widow who by a simple act—just the giving of two mites to God—won, we may believe, a heavenly reward, and, besides, an earthly glory as a faithful, loving soul, quite as imperishable as that glory with which the Church of the Epiphany has crowned itself,—as the producer of light operatic diversion.

A special despatch of three hundred words from Montclair, New Jersey, to the New York "Sun," gives the particulars of a Poverty Sociable given there. The First Baptist Church—it may be presumed under a profound conviction of the sinfulness of the pride of the flesh

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the vain pomp of the world—invited its young people to a social gathering to be distinguished by plainness of dress. The wearing of various specified articles of costly apparel was punishable by fines ranging from two cents to ten dollars. At about nine o'clock the reverend pastor of the church entered, and the judges promptly fined him five cents for wearing a linen collar. The pastor, however, turned the collar up, and there, written in ink, were the words, "Borrowed from Mr. C——." The fine had to be remitted, but the pastor was then fined in the sum of two cents for his linen cuffs, whereupon he turned the cuffs, and the legend appeared, "Borrowed from Mr. K——." The reverend gentleman was not permitted to go, however, without paying ten cents as a penalty for false pretences. The judges fined one visitor ten cents for wearing a linen shirt, but upon investigation the supposed shirt was found to be nothing more than a pasteboard bosom, and then the judges fined him fifty cents for deception. While another guest was being examined by the judges as a suspect, he bolted to the garret, and was captured only after a threatened levy of an increased fine. Money was exacted from two young men for the privilege of flirting, and the wearing of varnished shoes was a source of considerable income. Altogether the fines netted seventy-five dollars. We get here one of those tender and beautiful scenes which do so much to impress the world with the consecration and earnestness of the modern Church. The timid Christian flees to the garret; the pastor turns his collar and his cuffs. How inspiring and sweet and Christ-like!

It was the same evening that the enterprising Baptist Church of Avon, a small town in Massachusetts, delighted the public with a Living Picture Show. Before the uncurtaining of the *tableaux vivants*, a soprano sang "Heart of my Heart," and that dainty love-song "Celeste"; and an elocutionist rendered humorous selections,—he did it well, the town paper adds, with a touch of local color, in spite of a bad cold. "Over the Garden Wall" and "Rock of Ages" were appropriately sung during the presentation of those scenes in the living pictures.

That week, in the adjoining town of Stoughton, the Universalist Church, with an eye single to the glory of God, gave a Female Negro Minstrel Show. The jokes of the black-faced merrymakers were uproariously funny. Some of them were of such a character, being profane, that they would not be admitted to the pages of THE FORUM; but this one will give an idea of their moral elevation:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Do you know why Mr. B—— built his new house away up there beyond the cemetery?"

"I don't. Why did Mr. B—— build his house away up beyond the cemetery?"

"He wanted to be sure of a home beyond the grave."

It is gratifying to see a Christian Church thus witnessing to the reality of the other life, and so reverently employing expressions sacred to all men.

Female Minstrel Shows have been this year the most popular of church entertainments in Massachusetts. These interesting religious events have exerted their enlightening and refining influence in almost every part of the Commonwealth. Most of them have been arranged and conducted with great ability, and with the keenest appreciation of the tastes of the sporting and amusement-loving public. At Middleboro the Unitarians enlivened their minstrel performance with a song-and-dance turn, an impersonation of the Bowery Girl, and a skirt dance.

As I close this record, the account of the last annual May Festival of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church at Melrose, Massachusetts, reaches me. This year the festival, following the prevailing fashion, took the form of an entertainment by female minstrels,—"Miss Trilby Foote, the interlocutress, taking the lead in one of the liveliest performances which this ancient town has witnessed for many years. No less pleasant was the dance which followed, lasting till two o'clock in the morning."

No real novelties in the entertainment line appear to have originated in church circles this season, unless the Menagerie of Living Animals, advertised by St. John's Church, Bangor, Maine, be one. I do not recall having heard before of this method of making the beasts and cattle praise the Lord. The Coxey Social, a sacred dissipation sufficiently described by its name, has not proven popular. It was invented by "The Monthly Social," a prosperous-looking magazine for the promotion of ecclesiastical entertainments, which brings many diverting novelties to the attention of the reverend clergy. I refrain from advertising it by mentioning the place of its publication.

Of one act which is recorded among this year's contrivances for raising funds, it is impossible to speak calmly. In the Congregational Church of Middleboro, Massachusetts, on Sunday, March 24, 1895, being the Lord's Day, at the regular hours for divine worship, morning and evening, a sale of small pictures was conducted. The pictures found nearly a hundred customers, and brought from one to two dollars each. They were sold by the pastor, the communion-table being turned into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an auctioneer's stand. The payments were made, and the goods delivered,—on the spot! This is not a case concerning which it is adequate to refer to Christ's driving the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. The offence of the Jews was nothing to this, which not only defiled the house of God, but also profaned the Lord's Day, mocked the holy desire of those who wished to worship, and insolently violated the statutes of the Commonwealth. It may be too much to expect religious societies, in their ungodly strife, to remember the laws of Him whom they profess to serve; but when they thus openly and impudently defy State law and common morality, on what ground can decent people be asked to support or even to tolerate them? And when a priest who feels upon him the vows of his office, who esteems his Holy Orders a divine commission to rebuke sin and call men to righteousness in the name of God, sees division of those who should be one, the desecration and commercialization of holy things, and religion made an article of traffic or an actual crime,—what considerations of delicacy, of regard for private feelings, or for his own personal ease, what disheartening knowledge that he will be left to stand in his fight alone, can stop his mouth?

I charge, then, that, besides its hundred other sins, the division of the Church—most absurd and inexcusable of economic errors—has desecrated holy places and holy days; has assaulted all reverence; has given thousands who might have been won to the higher life an utterly ignoble conception of religion; has reduced Christian congregations to the level of fakirs and poor actors; has turned clergy into scrambling mountebanks; and has dishonored Christian womanhood.

The world does not need the Church as a purveyor of vaudeville; the Church does not deserve perpetuation even for the glory with which it may crown itself as the producer of light operatic diversion. The world does need and is piteously crying out for the Church to do that for which—divided—it is hopelessly inefficient. Let the vision of the Catholic Church take possession of the souls of men, and in place of the pauperized sects which, rivalling each other in vulgarity, contend for the miserable dollar of the public, the world will see an Institution consecrated again to the service of humanity, to the proclamation of the Gospel, to the spreading of the story of the tragedy and sacrifice of Calvary, generously maintained by a charity eager to witness to the constraining power of the love of our Saviour.

WILLIAM BAYARD HALE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMAN AND THE BICYCLE.

WHEN the social and economic history of the nineteenth century comes to be written, the historian cannot ignore the invention and development of the bicycle. The "wheel," as it is familiarly called, is now seen in all parts of the world; its production has given rise to a large and profitable industry; and in the United States alone there are a hundred manufactories for the construction of these machines. A large capital is invested in them, and they furnish occupation and a livelihood for thousands of wage-earners.

Bicycle-riding has changed the habits of hundreds of thousands who formerly took little or no exercise in the open air. It has widened the mental horizon for many by inducing them to undertake long rides far away from their homes, and has even become a link of international intercourse. Many an American now spends his vacation wheeling in England; and English bicyclists are often seen on the fine roads of France or on the picturesque and historical borders of the Rhine. A couple of young Americans have even successfully traversed the wilds of Asia, through countries that had never before received the imprint of a white man's foot. The bicycle has also called into new and flourishing life the old-fashioned, cosy, but unpretentious wayside inn, that had been almost driven out of existence by the railroad.

One of the striking and most charming characteristics of wheeling is that it is indulged in by persons of nearly every age. We meet the little five-year-old boy and his white-haired grandfather astride of their bicycles. Women have taken to the new sport with no less enthusiasm than men; and, finding their costume unpractical, have to a great extent changed it. Dress-reform, talked of for a generation or two, has suddenly become a reality.

In order to be an enjoyment and to reach the perfection of which it is capable, bicycling requires good, smooth roads. No wonder, therefore, that when so many thousands of people everywhere took up the new exercise, the demand for better roads became universal. In several places special roads have been constructed for the exclusive use of bicyclists, and others on a magnificent scale have been promised

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or are being built,—such as the forty-mile Aqueduct Road in the State of New York, and the twelve-mile road from Trenton to Asbury Park in New Jersey.

To trace the origin of the bicycle we must go back to the beginning of the century. In the year 1816 the "celeripede" was invented in France, and the "draisine" in Germany. Both these machines had two wheels of equal size, like the modern "Safety" bicycle, but no pedals; the rider propelling the machine by striking his feet against the ground. The driving-gear was invented by a Scotchman, McMillan, in 1840, and improved in 1845 by Dalzell, another Scotchman; but both of these used rods instead of a chain. Michaux, a French carriage-repairer, invented the crank and pedal in 1855, and may be regarded as the real inventor of the modern bicycle. The first bicycle —or, as the machine was then called, "velocipede"—was exhibited at the International Exposition in Paris in the year 1865, and during the two following years velocipede-riding was fashionable in Paris, the Prince Imperial himself being an elegant rider. At that time elegance was more aimed at than speed, the rider sat upright on the machine, and there was no racing. Subsequent improvements of the velocipede were made chiefly in England, where the "high" or "ordinary" wheel took shape about the year 1876. Since 1869 the word "bicycle" supplanted "velocipede." The first foreign bicycles exhibited in America were seen at the International Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876; and the first manufactured here appeared in the following year, the first rider being Alfred D. Chandler, a distinguished lawyer of Boston.

This development of the high wheel may, however, be considered as a step in the wrong direction, as the machine was so difficult to mount and so dangerous to ride that its use was almost wholly limited to young men. This type is now nearly obsolete, but if it had been retained, bicycling would never have reached its present importance,—indeed it would perhaps soon have been superseded by other pastimes. But in 1885 the "Safety" bicycle was started in England, and soon became so popular all over the world that since 1890 practically no other machines have been sold. A "Safety" consists essentially of an iron frame, to which are attached two wheels of equal or nearly equal and moderate size, about twenty-eight inches in diameter, and placed one behind the other. At the lower end of the frame is a sprocket-wheel, which is driven round by two pedals fastened to cranks so disposed that one is at a distance of 180° from the other—that is to say, when one is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the way down toward the ground, the other is on the top above the sprocket-wheel. From this sprocket-wheel an endless chain goes to a similar but smaller wheel placed at the hub of the posterior riding-wheel. The proportion between these two sprocket-wheels varies considerably on different wheels, but is, on an average, such that for every revolution of the sprocket-wheel driven by the pedals, the hind wheel makes about two and a half revolutions. The saddle is fastened to the frame so as to be situate over the front part of the hind wheel. Over the front wheel is a horizontal and curved handle-bar, by which is turned a perpendicular pivot ending in a fork attached to the centre of the front wheel. The front and rear wheels have thick rubber tires, which counteract the vibration caused by the inequalities of the road,—so-called "cushion" or "pneumatic" tires, the former of which has a smaller hollow core than the latter.

As to the way of using a bicycle, we may distinguish mounting, position, propulsion, direction, and equilibrium. Mounting is to most beginners a difficult task. As a rule, it is advisable to have assistance in doing so until one has learned to ride. There are many ways of mounting, but it is more or less difficult to obtain the necessary equilibrium to start with. Men commonly, at least in the beginning, mount from behind, push the machine forward, and place the left foot on a little step found at the hub of the hind wheel. A good way of mounting for a woman rider is to slant the machine a little toward the body, step on the farthest pedal, which should previously be placed (on the downward stroke) at an angle of about thirty-five degrees with the ground, raise herself with a downward pressure into the saddle, and place the other foot on the lower pedal while it is rising. In regard to attitude, three different positions are in use by bicyclists,—the upright, the curved, and the bent. In the upright posture the spinal column is kept straight, the shoulders are thrown back, and the weight of the body rests on the saddle. This posture is by far the best from a hygienic and medical standpoint. It is also safer in case of falls; it is the only one that can be called graceful; and it makes easier the direction of the front wheel and the maintenance of equilibrium. It should therefore be used by all except racers, and especially by beginners, old men, children, and women. However, it is seen quite exceptionally in the male rider, and even many women prefer the second posture.

In the second posture the back is curved, and the spine forms a somewhat acute angle with the saddle; the head hangs forward; the shoulders fall forward and inward; and a great part of the weight of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the body is carried over on the handle-bar, and from it to the front wheel. By assuming this curved position the rider realizes some gain in swiftness, and in a better distribution of the jars caused by inequalities in the road; but he buys it at a high price. The lungs are compressed, and the circulation in the lower limbs—which ought to be particularly favored, since they do nearly all the work—is impeded by pressure on the large blood-vessels, arterial and venous, which are situated in the pelvic cavity and convey the blood to and from the lower extremities. The cartilages separating the vertebræ are compressed in their anterior part; and if much riding is done by children and young people before full bodily development has been reached, this may cause a permanent atrophy and the resulting incurable curvature of the spine. The pressure on the anterior wheel makes the movement necessary for directing the whole machine less delicate. If the rider is thrown from his wheel, he is much more likely to fall on the head or hands, which may cost him his life, or lead to a fracture, not to speak of the loss of nearly all grace in attitude and movement.

The third position, which, to distinguish it from the second, we call "the bent," is an exaggeration of the preceding, the rider stooping so much forward that his back is almost parallel with the ground. This posture reduces the resistance of the air to a minimum,—an item of considerable importance when the wheel is driven at a great speed, and especially when against the wind. It becomes, therefore, a necessity for racers, whose only thought is of winning the race; but it should never be used by others, as from both hygienic and æsthetic standpoints it is the worst possible position. The rider goes at a speed that makes falls quite dangerous, and he submits his heart to an amount of work to which it may not be equal.

In order to understand how a bicycle is propelled, it is necessary to know that all bodily movements are accomplished by muscles, bones, and joints. The muscles are the real motors, the bones form levers, and the joints are the hinges between them, allowing them to work under constantly varying angles. A muscle is only capable of contraction and relaxation. It is only by contraction that it moves the levers, approximating the points of its origin and insertion. Relaxation is a mere passive process, which facilitates the work of another muscle or set of muscles. These two conditions of contraction and relaxation are under the control of the nervous system, a bundle of nerve fibrils entering each muscle and bringing it into connection with certain parts of the nerve centres,—the brain and the spinal marrow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A bicycle is propelled by a pressure exercised by the lower extremities. The rider places the balls of his feet on the pedals, and presses the upper one down. This is the chief active movement, and is consummated by extension. The corresponding flexion is, however, not entirely passive, although it is greatly aided by the extension of the other extremity. Thus there is a continual and rapid alternation between extension and flexion. At the end of the downward movement the foot has to carry the lower pedal backward, or at least has to be stretched in order to be able to follow the pedal in its backward movement caused by the front movement of the other pedal. Otherwise the foot loses hold on the pedal,—an accident that usually compels the beginner to dismount. The foot is necessarily carried backward if—as expert riders often do for amusement—only one pedal is used. Only those muscles used for extension are vigorously worked, and by a law of nature are thereby much increased in size. We shall therefore find the muscles on the back of the pelvis, the front of the thigh, and the back or calf of the leg, largely developed in those who ride the wheel much.

On the other hand, the movements needed for flexion being much less active,—in fact mostly passive,—the muscles needed in their execution are not much increased in bulk. An unfounded anxiety, therefore, has been caused by some writers who have predicted an aggravation of labor pains for the parturient woman, on account of the increased bulk of the muscles contiguous to the entrance of the parturient canal—the superior strait of the pelvis—namely, the psoas and iliacus internus. We shall later see that, by riding the wheel, woman, far from diminishing her fitness for this supreme act in her life, actually renders herself more capable of meeting the ordeal.

The direction in which a bicycle moves depends on the position of the front wheel, which is determined by the handle-bar. This wheel also serves another purpose in preventing the rider from falling. By turning the front wheel in the direction in which the machine tends to fall, and at the same time leaning the trunk of the body in the opposite direction, the vanishing equilibrium may be regained.

The body being so much wider than the rim of the wheels placed on a line one behind the other, the keeping of the equilibrium on the machine is an art to be learned. It is particularly difficult to obtain it in mounting, while once acquired it is comparatively easy to maintain, and the faster the machine is driven the easier it becomes. When once a person has become familiar with the machine, there are few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limits to his successful defiance of the law of gravitation. Most riders of experience acquire such facility that they ride with the legs alone, without using the arms; *vice versa*, they coast down a hill without using the pedals; or they drive the machine by means of one pedal alone,—an accomplishment of great practical value in case of an accident at a distance from a place where repairs can be made.

Every beginner will fall frequently, and it is as necessary to learn to fall in the right way as to ride properly. Although it is easier to keep one's equilibrium in riding fast than when the machine is driven slowly or stands still, the inevitable falls become much more dangerous if they occur while the machine is in rapid motion. The first rule for a beginner is, therefore, to ride slowly until he has mastered the difficulties of equilibration. Next, in falling, he should never let go his hold on the handle-bar, but direct the wheel as best he can; and he should, if possible, give the machine time to slow up before he falls. He should throw the leg on which he is to fall well out, and follow the machine by hopping on this foot after it has reached the ground.

For comfortable and safe riding a suitable attire is necessary, the object being to avoid anything that is apt to be caught by the machine. Men are obliged to tie a string around the lower ends of their trousers above the ankles, or to use the convenient steel bands made for the purpose. But it is certainly more convenient, and presents a better appearance, to wear breeches that only descend to the knee, and to cover the leg with tight-fitting stockings or leggings. The upper part of the body should be covered with a garment exposing as small a surface as possible, be it a buttoned coat or a so-called "sweater." The shoes should preferably be low-cut and have transverse furrows in the soles for a better adaptation to the pedals.

But how should women be dressed for bicycling? The usual long skirt is objectionable in every respect. It impedes the free movement of the legs, pumps air up against the abdomen, and is in great danger of being caught by projecting parts of their own machines or those of other riders, as well as by other obstructions found on the road. To avoid these inconveniences many women have shortened their skirts, and some have done away with them altogether, wearing so-called "bloomers," a wide, bifurcated garment extending from the waist to the knee. This garment, combined with a waist and leggings, forms a neat, practical dress for a woman rider. True, it is at present ridiculed and even condemned by some as immodest. However, before men say anything against the decency of bloomers, they had better reform their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own trousers, which are not much more decent than becoming; and since a bathing costume—allowing the lower limbs from the knees to the tips of the toes to be exposed in tight-fitting stockings—is admitted by every one as a proper costume for a woman to appear in on a beach frequented by hundreds of lookers-on of both sexes, it is hard to understand what objection there is in the name of modesty against a piece of wearing-apparel that by its wide proportions entirely hides the outlines of the body.

From a medical standpoint bicycling is valuable both as a prophylactic and as a curative agent. Like other outdoor exercises it takes its votaries away from the vitiated air of closed rooms; but it has several advantages peculiarly its own. It is less expensive and safer than horseback-riding. For the female sex it is also healthier, since horseback-riding, if indulged in too much or at too early an age, is apt to produce a funnel-shaped pelvis, which abnormality may prove a serious obstacle to childbirth. It has much more variety and interest than walking, except in localities that offer such steep ascents and descents that the bicycle cannot be used. It also allows the rider to see much more and to cover a much greater distance in the same time. It has the advantage over games that it can be indulged in for a longer time without causing fatigue or becoming tedious.

Although we have seen that certain groups of muscles come chiefly into play, all the muscles of the body are used more or less, and are thereby strengthened. Good fresh air is plentifully drawn into the lungs, and the capacity of these organs is increased, especially by maintaining the straight position in riding. A person who only works and walks hardly ever fills his lungs; but the bicyclist needs all the air he can inspire, and good respiration causes a more perfect oxidation of the blood, and good blood means healthy tissues, strong nerves, and normal secretions. Normal peptic juices digest all food. The elimination of waste material through the skin and lungs is increased; which also purifies the blood. The whole nervous system is highly benefited by bicycling. The rider must constantly use the senses of hearing, seeing, and feeling in order to avoid collisions, direct his machine, and keep his equilibrium. This exercise, therefore, is in a high degree apt to draw the mind away from its usual pursuits and the cares of daily life. It is highly exhilarating and promotes sociability, since it is both pleasanter and safer to ride in company than alone. In women it is apt to overcome the impulsiveness and whimsicality which render so many of them unhappy. It has also a beneficent effect on a purely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

physical condition peculiar to their sex. From the upper corners of the womb extends a string that goes through a canal in the lower part of the abdominal wall, and is fastened to the bones and skin between the thighs. This string is called a ligament, but microscopical examination shows that it is composed of both voluntary and involuntary muscle-bundles. This organ is of the greatest importance in maintaining the uterus in its proper position, and in preventing its displacement backward and downward, a fruitful source of suffering. This same organ is much enlarged during pregnancy, and in childbirth has the important function of directing the child under a favorable angle against the entrance of the canal it has to pass in order to begin its separate and individual existence. And this organ, being of muscular construction, is, like all other muscles, strengthened by bicycling.

If bicycling is an excellent preventive of disease and a promoter of good health, it is of no less value as a remedy for certain pathological conditions. It is not compatible with the limits and nature of a magazine article intended for general readers to enter into details about the treatment of diseases. I shall therefore limit myself to a few remarks. By its effect on respiration and digestion, bicycling becomes a potent remedy for anæmia, that condition of the blood which consists in a diminution of the red blood-corpuscles, and shows itself in pallor of the skin and the mucous membranes. Numerous nervous troubles are relieved or cured by this exercise: such as neurasthenia, or nervous prostration,—a condition usually due to overwork or worry, and in which the normal strength is lost, and the slightest exertion causes fatigue and physical and mental exhaustion. The same holds good in regard to headache, insomnia, and neuralgia. The writer once treated a little girl for a wound received by falling astride of a sharp edge. The wound soon healed, but the patient continued for years to have a neuralgic pain in the scar, which pain entirely disappeared when the sufferer took to bicycling. Among the nervous affections benefited by bicycle-riding may also be included that troublesome disease, asthma, a cramp-like contraction of the muscles of the bronchial tubes, which causes a painful sensation of choking. In the beginning of phthisis, where parts of the lung tissue become condensed and less pervious, moderate bicycle-riding is helpful. Many diseases of the intestinal canal—such as dyspepsia, constipation, and hæmorrhoids—yield to the effects of wheeling. A case has recently come to the writer's knowledge in which the stiffness remaining after a fracture of the leg was successfully treated by riding a bicycle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But if bicycling is a valuable resource in certain diseased conditions, there are numerous others in which it is harmful or should only be indulged in very cautiously. Most acute diseases demand rest, and bid the bicyclist abstain from his favorite pursuit; and many chronic diseases are made worse by riding. Since wheeling considerably increases the rate of the respiratory movements it would be folly for a person with advanced pulmonary consumption to attempt to ride. The heart being whipped unmercifully to work in driving the machine, bicycling should be strictly forbidden in serious diseases of this organ; and persons affected with minor cardiac troubles ought at least never to race or otherwise expose the heart to a fatigue which it is not prepared to stand.

Women should abstain from riding during those periods in which undue exercise is apt to exert a deleterious influence on their general health. They ought also to abstain during pregnancy, since the riding might cause a miscarriage, and a fall from the machine might endanger two lives. Pelvic inflammation, which is so common in their sex, is also a barrier to wheeling so long as any pain or soreness is felt.

Even for people enjoying perfect health, bicycling is not free from dangers and drawbacks which cannot be ignored, and which cannot always be guarded against. Collisions with other riders, with vehicles, or with pedestrians, are of constant and sometimes fatal occurrence, and such accidents are frequently entirely independent of the riders' skill, especially on the streets of populous cities and on crowded suburban roads. But in order to prevent an exaggerated estimate of those dangers we ought to keep in mind the enormous number of the devotees of the exercise. It is calculated that a hundred thousand machines are in use in the city of New York alone, and a proportionately large number is used in other cities and in the country. Taking this widespread use of bicycles into consideration, the percentage of accidents is certainly a very small one, and the "wheel" in this respect compares favorably with horseback-riding, driving, swimming, sailing, and skating.

Apart from injuries, the rider's health and harmonious development may suffer; but, as a rule, he can obviate this in different ways. In order not to draw cold air and dust into the lungs, he should invariably keep his mouth closed and breathe through his nose, the many narrow passages and profound anfractuosities of which are well fitted to warm and, as it were, filter the air. This kind of breathing is the best for every one, but it is of particular importance to the bicyclist, who often rides on dusty roads, and by the exertion is compelled to breathe much more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frequently and more deeply than a person who sits still or who walks at a moderate pace. Since the rapid motion and muscular exertion make the rider perspire freely, he is apt to catch cold while he rests. He should therefore use woollen or silk underwear, be careful to avoid draughts while resting, and change all his clothes at the end of a trip that has made him perspire. Those who ride much at a very early age are apt to become deformed by a disproportionate development of the lower limbs. Persons who spend much time in the curved or bent posture are likely to become round-shouldered and hollow-chested. If a person uses a wheel that is too heavy in proportion to his strength, he is obliged to move from side to side in order to utilize his weight as a propelling force,—a motion which is fatiguing and looks bad, and in women is decidedly objectionable.

From a sanitary standpoint athletics ought to be used for a harmonious development of the *whole* body,—the doctrine and practice of the old Greeks. Bicycling gives more general development than most other sports, but on account of the preponderating use of the lower extremities, and the drawbacks of the stooping position so commonly affected by bicyclists, it ought to be combined with other exercises; as rowing, which develops the muscles of the back and the arm; and the use of dumb-bells, which develops all muscles of the body and more especially those of the arms and trunk.

I have spoken of bicycling only as a pastime and a sport, but it has already proved itself capable of being utilized for many purposes in practical life. In some cities and in some parts of the country physicians have adopted the wheel as a means of inexpensive, pleasant, healthful, and rapid locomotion. In a city like New York, with its poor cobble-stone pavements, this would hardly be feasible. The policemen have to some extent adopted the wheel, if for nothing else than for the power of overtaking erring bicyclists. Many stores have small delivery-wagons built as tricycles. The Street-Cleaning Department is mounting its inspectors on bicycles. Even for warfare the peaceable bicycle has been pressed into service, wheelmen being used to carry messages from one part of the territory occupied by a military force to another. Bicycling is therefore no longer a mere fashion that may fall into disuse and give way to a new one. It is a wholesome and inspiring exercise, and has proved of practical value as a means of rapid locomotion.

HENRY J. GARRIGUES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "GERMAN VOTE" AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

ONE of the most characteristic features of the history of American party politics during the year 1895 is the peculiar prominence given to the political attitude of the great class of Americans of German birth or extraction, more especially in the State and city of New York. As was the case in Wisconsin in 1890, and in Illinois in 1891 and 1892, local questions of quite subordinate importance to national issues created an apparent solidarity of what was called the "German vote"; and a serious divergence of views—not to say antagonism—was observed between the aims and aspirations of many patriotic native Americans and the great mass of their countrymen of German origin. Should this solidarity and this antagonism continue, it would be a serious and disturbing factor in our political and social development. A new force would in that case confront politicians of all parties, the true character and importance of which they have as yet shown few signs of comprehending. Such a result would be deplorable from every nobler point of view, and with wisdom, patriotism, and a better understanding it can easily be avoided.

Political antagonisms based, however remotely, upon race prejudice, afford the most dangerous opportunities to demagogues and small minds of every description. Accordingly, German-Americans are constantly warned against "nativistic" conspiracies against their welfare, and on the other hand a tendency to underestimate their services in the upbuilding of this nation, and to sneer at "beery and ignorant foreigners," is also noticeable. Not that any American politician would so far forget himself as to underestimate the numerical strength of his German-American fellow citizens: on the contrary, the magnitude of this vote is always spoken of most respectfully; and among the most valued bait in the average candidate's outfit there will invariably be found an affable recognition of the deliciousness and invigorating qualities of beer; a eulogy of German family life; and a cordial praise of gymnastics (for a *Turn-fest*), of target shooting (for a *Schuetzen-fest*), and of the deep, rich harmonies of a male chorus (for a *Saengerbund* or *Liedertafel*). Occasionally, too, an ambitious citizen with a German-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sounding name succeeds in having himself nominated—generally for the office of coroner or county superintendent of the poor (although instances of higher offices are not wanting)—for the purpose of catching the "German vote." The returns generally prove that such candidates get few of the German votes,—less than their American or Irish competitors,—much to the surprise of the politicians who have been duped into making the nominations; and this surprise is apt to be deepened into uneasy amazement when the fact is observed that, somehow or other, the most honest and high-minded candidate on either ticket, and the one most clearly standing for fitness, progress, and true Americanism, seems generally to run best where the "German vote" is strongest. A brief examination of these phenomena and their causes, as well as their exceptions,—more especially as illustrated by the New York campaign of 1895,—may not be without interest.

Of all forecasts that can be made to-day regarding the future of the United States of America, none seems more reasonable than that the civilization of this nation will be essentially Germanic in its fundamental characteristics. It may in truth be said that, from the loftiest point of view of universal history, the most important event in the nineteenth century—at least so far as Western civilization is concerned—may easily prove to be the reunion (after a separation of fourteen hundred years) of the Germanic race—Anglo-Saxons and Teutons—upon the virgin soil of the new continent. A century ago, as Mr. Kidd graphically describes in his "Social Evolution," it was a grave question whether the Celtic or Anglo-Saxon race was to predominate in the nineteenth century. This question was answered for Europe by the expansion of England and the decline of the purely Celtic peoples. So far as the United States was concerned, the issue was never doubtful: and it was settled for all time when the great tide of German, Austrian, and Swiss emigration to this country set in. The descendants of those sturdy and enterprising tribes who bade farewell to each other on the bleak shore of the North Sea in 449 are to-day the undisputed masters, for good or for evil, of the destinies of this great continent. As Lord Acton beautifully expressed it in his inaugural lecture at Cambridge, "the dense web of the fortunes of man is woven without a void; . . . in society, as in nature, the structure is continuous, and we can trace things back uninterruptedly until we dimly descry the Declaration of Independence in the forests of Germany." It remains to glance briefly at the part which the newest comers from the fatherland of all took in the most recent political struggles of their new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home. At the outset, however, it should be clearly understood that I hold no brief for my fellow countrymen of German birth or descent, and that my right to speak for them is measured by the impartiality and sincerity with which I have endeavored to learn and observe the phenomena here described, as well as by the accuracy of my observations. For the fact that I write from the point of view of a Republican I have no apology to offer. The time has not yet come when the political events since the war can be considered entirely without partisan bias. I have, indeed, endeavored to minimize this feeling, and to present what I consider to be the views of a great majority of German-Americans, often without regard to my individual opinion.

Mr. James Ford Rhodes calls the Kansas-Nebraska Act "the most momentous measure that passed Congress from the day that the Senators and Representatives first met, to the outbreak of the Civil War"; [1] and among its most important consequences he counts the fact that "it caused the Germans to become Republicans." The same impartial authority has declared that "never in our history, and probably never in the history of the world, had a more pure, more disinterested, and more intelligent body of men banded together for a noble political object than those who now enrolled themselves under the Republican banner." [2]

The German-Americans of that day were fresh from the idealistic but ineffectual struggle for liberty in their Fatherland in 1848. Reared upon the liberty-loving literature of the "Young Germany," knowing by experience the hateful tyranny of Metternich and the Holy Alliance, and having their ardor inflamed by their very failure, they threw themselves into the struggle for freedom against slavery in their adopted country with all the fervor of German idealism. The class of German emigrants which came to this country from 1849 to 1859 was superior in intellectual force to any that preceded or followed it. Accordingly they not only took the most lively interest in the affairs of their adopted country, but also remained in close touch with thought and discussion in their Old-World home. German political speculation was never more liberal than in this very decade, and never was it more intensely national in its tendencies. The weakness of the disrupted, prince-ridden Fatherland was doubly felt under the newly strengthened reign of reaction and feudalism; and who can wonder that the revolutionary emigrants sought the inspiration of a truly national life, and that, land-

[1] "History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850," Vol. I, p. 491.

[2] Ibid. Vol. II, p. 210.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing on these shores, they felt themselves as Americans rather than as citizens of any particular State.

The Republican party—being at once national, liberal, and eminently idealistic—naturally attracted all these elements. Accordingly the young German leaders—Schurz, Kapp, Stallo, and Salomon, with Lieber, Koerner, Hecker, Muench, and other veterans—became Republican partisans and did excellent work upon the stump in both English and German. Of eighty-eight German papers, eighty opposed the Kansas-Nebraska iniquity of Douglas, and only eight ventured to defend it.[1] Another cause helped this tendency. The Irish element remained faithful to the Democratic party, and while there has been no hostility between the two races, two prominent characteristics of Irish-American politicians put them into direct antagonism with the Germans. These were, first, a proneness to trade on nationality as a political makeweight; and, secondly, the corruption of city governments by considering them simply as the spoils of local quasi-political warfare. German-Americans abhorred both propensities most intensely. The professional "German-American" politician did not exist, and has never been able to exist for any length of time. In fact it soon became apparent to both parties that the Germans were inclined to look with suspicion upon candidates of their own nationality, and that the slightest indication of a desire to use a candidate as "bait" for German votes was fatal to the chances of the ticket. As to municipal government, the Germans remembered the model administration of the cities in Germany, and naturally regarded with shame and indignation the semi-criminal combinations for municipal plunder which were organized in various cities, generally calling themselves "Democratic," and in which the Irish element predominated.

The entire intellectual and political force of this new element was thus thrown into the new Republican party with a momentum which seemed irresistible and likely to be as permanent as the party itself. As a matter of fact, the impulse then given has not been overcome so long as the German-Americans were convinced that the Republican party was indeed the national party of progress; and only when the party seemed to fall short of this ideal has it lost its hold upon this vote. Of course it is not claimed that there was ever even substantial unanimity on the part of the Germans in their political action, and the

[1] Rhodes, "History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850," Vol. I, p. 495. See also Von Holst's "Constitutional History" (Lalor's translation), Vol. IV, pp. 427–429, for a general discussion of the subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history of the efforts of patriotic and high-minded German Democrats to idealize and purify their party, and to remove from it the taint of disloyalty and separatism, is most honorable and interesting. Still the preponderance of the Republicans down to 1892 was sufficiently great to warrant a disregard of German Democrats everywhere—except in New York and perhaps Missouri—as a negligible quantity.

The loyalty of the Germans during the war, known of all men, and proved on every battlefield, included a sincere and unwavering support of the party entrusted with the imperilled government. When peace returned, the question of honest money became more urgent, and appealed to the sturdy sense of financial honor which has always distinguished the Teutonic races. The honorable stand taken by German-Americans everywhere against inflation, as well as against the silver craze, has been too often noted and commented upon to require more than slight mention here. In the eyes of the German-Americans the Democratic party has never entirely recovered from its surrender to unsound-money schemes, beginning with the repudiationist Greenback platform of 1868. The absurd candidacy of Greeley in 1872 was not calculated to shake their loyalty, nor were they deeply impressed with the cry of "Tilden and Reform" in 1876.

With the Administration of President Hayes the questions arising from the war seemed to be settled, and on the issue of sound finance against greenback inflation, or the free-silver movement, and of civil-service reform against the spoils system, scarcely an effort was necessary to retain this vote on the Republican side. But about this time the first signs of serious party deterioration, from the German-American point of view, became visible. New issues were sought, to take the place of those which had been so honorably decided; and to the superficial mind of the average politician,—especially in the West, where activity and excitement for some "moral" cause seemed a necessity,—the suppression of intemperance by rigorous prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages seemed to be a reform worthy of a great party's championship. The moral wrong involved in the curtailment of reasonable personal liberty which was necessary to make prohibition effective, was overlooked, and almost without a warning Republicans in the two "banner" States of Iowa and Kansas were committed to a cause diametrically opposed to those principles of freedom upon which the party was founded. Prohibitory laws were enacted by Republican legislatures, signed by Republican governors, and indorsed by Republican conventions, which vied with the Southern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slave codes in injustice and atrocity. A flood of fanaticism on this subject and upon the two kindred issues of woman's suffrage and Sabbatarianism arose all over the country, and the stanchest Republican —unless he happens to be a sympathizer with these ideas—must confess that his party showed little of its old-time moral courage or wisdom in meeting and disposing of these new and difficult issues.

Heinrich von Treitschke, in his great "History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," repeatedly refers to one characteristic of the German mind when applied to politics, as being a most important factor in modern German history; namely, its insistence upon complete harmony of thought, doctrine, opinion, and performance: in other words, absolute political sincerity. In its extreme form this virtue leads to abstract theorizing and bootless action, of which, indeed, the inner history of Germany from 1815 to 1866 is a series of examples. Applied to American politics, where healthy realism and the Anglo-Saxon genius for compromise was never wanting, this habit of thought was a most valuable contribution, and its first practical effect was to make the Germans, with few exceptions, abolitionists. Similarly, such questions as prohibition, restriction of harmless and quiet Sunday pleasures, and female suffrage, were invariably measured by the thinking German with the rigorous standard of pure theory,—religious or secular. Failing to stand this crucial test, no amount of sentimental regard for sobriety, for Sunday rest, or for the wrongs of down-trodden females, can make any appreciable impression on his rule of action, and it would be churlish and unjust to ascribe this attitude to mere selfish indulgence. Among the German churches, and more especially the Lutheran, which is the largest of all, the objection to prohibition will be found as pronounced as among the secular societies, and this opposition is all the more effective since it rests upon a nobler and impregnable foundation.[1] Not in order to gratify his appetite, but as a protest

[1] In "Der Lutheraner," the ablest and most widely read organ of the orthodox German Lutherans in this country, Oct. 22, 1895, p. 180, the following language is used upon this subject:—

"We are decidedly against the saloon, in so far as and because it is, in this country, a place where godless worldliness asserts itself. Against drunkenness, as against all public sins, we proceed with church discipline. As a denomination we have indeed nothing to do with prohibition. But the reason for our attitude is not that we have so recently come from Europe, but because the Holy Scriptures do not command prohibition. We hold that the Church can forbid only what is forbidden in God's Word, and must permit all which God's Word permits. We know full well what terrible abuses are committed with spirituous liquors, and woe to the congregations who do not aggressively combat this abuse

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against a false and mischievous moral standard, does the temperate and liberal-minded American or German oppose all extreme legislation regarding the traffic in alcoholic beverages or the prohibition of harmless amusement on Sunday. He believes, upon the assurance of science as well as of reason, that the temperate use of pure stimulants is not only a positive good, but that it connotes—to use the logician's phrase—a higher and manlier type of character than bigoted total abstinence; and his fundamental principle regarding Sunday observance is a liberal and enlightened construction of the words of Christ: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Nor does he demand absolute freedom from governmental control for the liquor traffic, or unbridled dissipation on Sunday. On the contrary his support may always be had for rational and even severe restrictions in the interest of sobriety and order, so long as a great and fundamental difference is made, in excise legislation, between wines and beers on the one hand, and distilled liquors on the other, and so long as no Sabbatarian interference with proper enjoyment and recreation is permitted. Not by indiscriminate and silly denunciation of the "rum power," or cheap flings at "Sunday beer," but by serious and kindly work in the direction indicated, is it possible for sincere friends of sobriety, and of an orderly, attractive, and enjoyable Sunday, to check the evils which they are combating; and in these efforts they will have no sincerer assistance than that of their American fellow citizens of German birth or extraction.

Simultaneously with the struggle against prohibition, the German regard for the purity and inviolability of the family life, and the deep reverence with which the German race, since the days of Tacitus, has cherished the position of woman as the sacred guardian of domestic happiness, was offended by the continued overwrought agitation for female suffrage,—another phase of fanaticism which the Republican party, especially in the West, failed to condemn as vigorously as it deserved. That many intelligent and well-meaning persons of both sexes supported this "cause" could not be denied, and it was evident that most of them were Republicans. This did not, however, make the idea less offensive to the plain common sense of the Germans, who

wherever it asserts itself among them. Drunkards will not inherit the Kingdom of God. But we will not be driven to forbid, as a Church, more than God's Word forbids. To make additions to God's Word is popish. And, as Luther often said, where human commandments are countenanced by the Church, there God's Word is commonly soon disregarded."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cordially accept the doctrine of St. Paul as being founded upon nature and reason, whether it be regarded as divinely inspired or not; and by whom the recent attempts, sometimes successful, to place women in positions of power and authority over men, for which they are at least no better qualified than their male competitors, are regarded simply as signs of that degeneration which Dr. Nordau has so powerfully described. Whatever their differences may be on other points, in these questions the German-Americans may always be counted on as unitedly and grimly determined to protect both the sanctity of family life and the liberty of the individual. It is most creditable to their independence that, notwithstanding the fact that in local and State elections support of the Republican ticket was thus often rendered impossible, this had no influence on their course in national elections. The Republican party remained for them the party of progress, and even in 1884 and 1888, when extraordinary efforts were made to shake their allegiance, the great States of the West and Northwest, where the German vote is largest, remained faithful to the party.

As a general statement it may doubtless be affirmed that the great mass of German-Americans are moderate protectionists. This attitude involves opposition to the extreme position taken on the one hand by President Cleveland's tariff message of 1887, and on the other hand by the McKinley bill of 1890. The limits of this article forbid entering into details, but it cannot be doubted that the very general German-American support given to the Democratic ticket in 1892 must be ascribed in great part to this cause. Local reasons—such as the passage of the well-intentioned but ill-advised Bennett Law in Wisconsin, and the Edwards Law in Illinois—no doubt helped along the general drift; and there is little doubt that if the great victory of 1892 had been followed upon the part of the Democratic party by a vigorous and efficient administration of national affairs both at home and abroad, it would have retained the support of many of its new adherents.

So far as municipal reform is concerned it is safe to say that on the 1st of January, 1895, the eyes of the entire country were centred as they have never been before upon the city of New York. The election of 1894 had resulted in the complete overthrow of that gang of criminal or semi-criminal plunderers who under the name of Tammany Hall had held the city at their mercy for years, and had made its name a by-word the world over. In the overthrow of Tammany the German-Americans of New York had borne a most conspicuous part, although, even at this election, the one prominent German candidate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the Reform ticket received twenty thousand votes less than the candidate for mayor; and this defection was largest in the German-American wards of the city, thus proving beyond doubt what has been said before, that the mere fact that a candidate seemed to trade on his nationality for his nomination was sufficient to lose to him much of the support which he otherwise might have obtained.

This is not the place to recount in detail the history of the Reform administration of the city of New York. After its first five months two facts stood out prominently above all mistakes and minor differences of opinion: one was that New York, for the first time in its history, had been made a clean city,—cleaner than London or Paris, and quite as clean as Berlin or Vienna; the other was that a bench of City Magistrates and Judges of Special Sessions had been appointed of so high a character that good citizens could once more breathe freely when thinking of that most important interest, the administration of justice in its relation to the poor and to minor offenders. If at that time—say about the middle of June, 1895—the election could have occurred, presenting the issue of a continuance of Reform, or a return of Tammany Hall to power, it is safe to say that the majority for Reform would have been simply overwhelming.

On May 6, 1895, the new Police Commission, bi-partisan by law, was completed, and once more the police force of New York was controlled by men of the highest character and standing in the community. Among the problems which confronted the new Commission none seemed more difficult in some respects, and in others so simple, as that of the suppression or tolerance of open saloons and beer-gardens on Sunday. The letter of the law was perfectly clear, and it is a great mistake to suppose that it was entirely ignored in the Tammany *régime*. On the contrary, though considered obsolete by the public at large, its occasional enforcement was the most potent weapon for blackmail in the hands of the corrupt Tammany police force. The publican who paid tribute to his captain or roundsman was left unmolested, whereas his poorer or more refractory competitor was beset by spies in the shape of policemen in citizens' clothes, or paid hirelings and stool-pigeons, who first caused him to commit the offense of selling them liquors and then ruthlessly dragged him before a Tammany police justice, where his resistance to regular blackmail was speedily broken. A more infamous system of oppression, and a more criminal prostitution of governmental power, it is difficult to imagine; but perhaps its most vicious feature was the introduction, into the administration of petty criminal law in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this city, of the system of spies and *agents provocateurs*. While no reasonable man can deny the necessity for the employment of detectives in the case of crimes and felonies which are dangerous to the public weal, their use for the purpose of detecting violations of mere police ordinances or administrative regulations has always been regarded as wrong and demoralizing to the last degree. More infamous still are the practice of sworn officers of the law resorting to mendacity and deceit to persuade barkeepers to break the law for the purpose of making arrests, and the hiring of outsiders with public money at an agreed sum for each arrest, and a higher sum for each conviction. In no branch of the law has the difference between *mala in se* and *mala prohibita* been more carefully pointed out than in that branch of administrative law which treats of permissible methods for the prevention and detection of crime; and in no branch of administration is the maxim more dangerous that "the end justifies the means." The older class of emigrants from continental Europe are perfectly familiar with the outrages committed by the police, using similar methods, with reference to political offences, and consequently, among Americans of German birth, the hostility to the spy system, with its attendant scandals, is peculiarly deep-seated.

It is clear that only two methods were open to the new Police Commission, whose first object was necessarily to suppress the levying of blackmail by members of the police force. These were, either impartial toleration of open saloons and beer-gardens on Sunday, so far as they were quiet and orderly, on the ground that the law forbidding them was essentially obsolescent by common consent; or impartial suppression of the illegal acts so far as such suppression was possible by honest methods, and without greater scandal than is caused by the illegality itself. The first method had proved to be a complete success in the neighboring city of Brooklyn, during the brilliant administration of Mr. Seth Low, a man whose civic courage was open to as little doubt as his sturdy and delicate sense of public duty. Moreover the same policy was successfully carried out at this very time by Mayor Schieren in Brooklyn, and in every other large city of the State of New York, as well as in the great cities of the West. As a reason for not following these examples, the Commissioners gave their conscientious scruples against omitting the enforcement of any provision contained in the law which they had sworn to uphold. There can be no question as to their sincerity, although it may be doubted whether they realized that they were ostentatiously setting up a standard which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

branded many of the highest-minded men and administrators of the State as being, or having been, recreant to their official oaths. Moreover the Commissioners—goaded no doubt by the impudent tone adopted in the beginning by the representatives of loud-mouthed bibulousness—indulged in much heated denunciation of their critics, branding them all as criminals or as the allies of criminals, and, worst of all, insisting that any method was justifiable to get evidence against an offending barkeeper. Accordingly a series of weekly raids upon all saloons doing business even in a quiet and orderly manner during prohibited hours was organized. These raids have continued with more or less virulence ever since, and the rather grotesque name of "enforcement of the law" was persistently applied to them by their supporters, while all who doubted their wisdom were branded as traitors to the cause of law and order, who put the enjoyment of a glass of beer on Sunday above the welfare of the community and the sanctity of law. The Sunday raid became a standing attraction of the sensational Monday newspaper; and the manifestoes, letters, and speeches by some of the officials most deeply concerned, and by their opponents, became so numerous as to give apparent national importance to a purely ephemeral municipal teapot tempest.

When officers of the law are compelled to act as spies, scandals are bound to follow. Stories were soon heard of shameless mendacity, and of appeals to the humanity of barkeepers on the score of personal sickness or illness in the family, and other disreputable devices adopted by the over-zealous police spy. Paid stool-pigeons appeared in the police courts, and testified that they received out of the police fund $3 for each arrest and $5 for each conviction; and although honest magistrates promptly ordered such witnesses off the premises, some convictions were ultimately had. These were followed in some instances by sentences of barbarous severity.

Perhaps the time has not yet come to judge of these occurrences with the calmness of historical perspective, although signs are not wanting that the effervescence of this much-lauded "reform" has gone, leaving merely the rather stale result of a Tammany victory, and a serious division in the ranks of the friends of honest government.

In tracing its effect upon the so-called "German voters," a further glance at the Sunday controversy can hardly be avoided, and in view of the persistent misunderstanding and misrepresentation of their motives, from which sincere and thoughtful advocates of a more liberal policy suffer, it will be useful to re-state their principles and course

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of reasoning. They hold that no Sunday laws can be justified which interfere with such recreation and enjoyment as does not constitute an undue infringement of the substantial rights of others, and they maintain that the experience of Brooklyn and other cities at home and abroad proves that the quiet and orderly sale of stimulants does not necessarily constitute such an infringement. They point to the experience of the same cities under a system of impartial toleration, as a refutation of the argument that such a policy would result in police blackmail. They claim that it ought not to be necessary to remind an Anglo-Saxon community of the fact that legal fictions, and the assumed obsolescence of penal laws originating in a period of earlier development, and perhaps of less enlightenment, are as well recognized a method of legal progress as legislation. If by reason of the continued predominance of earlier and stricter views in a politically determining portion of the State, a repeal of such laws is impracticable, this expedient may properly and honestly be adopted by conscientious officials, in order to avoid greater injustice by apparent petty righteousness. This is particularly true in communities where the main object of the law is accomplished, even under a policy of toleration; where, moreover, a literal compliance with the statute would engender the fundamentally dangerous and evil passions of class hatred, malice, backbiting, and widespread hostility toward all law; and where public service on the part of any official lacking the requisite wisdom and steadiness, or having conscientious scruples against legal fictions and obsolescent statutes, is not compulsory. If answer is made that this theory, logically carried out, would result in haphazard nullification of law by different officials, and finally in anarchy, the reply seems conclusive that as a matter of fact the progress of English law *has been along just these lines*, involving in many instances a disregard of existing provisions which is absolutely unjustifiable in abstract theory. No human enactment can wholly and under all circumstances do away with the element of discretion in its enforcement, and the utmost which can be attained is that this discretion should be exercised wisely and with absolute good faith, instead of being used as an instrument of blackmail, or abandoned from a sense of mistaken righteousness. No law seems more fitted for gradual modification by the advance of public opinion than the Sunday law, especially in so far as it endeavors to maintain Puritanical ideas. It is indeed often admitted, even by Sabbatarians, that the only just reason for the intervention of the state in the preservation of Sunday is the general secular advantage to be derived by the community from one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day's rest in seven; but as a matter of fact, both in argument and in actual legislation, a different and essentially Puritanical position is tacitly assumed: to wit, that the state should enforce the moral duty of "keeping holy the Sabbath day," and that the just wrath of the jealous Almighty Ruler of the Universe should in some way be averted from these United States by at least passing laws, and enforcing them so far as practicable, which discourage any conduct on Sunday inconsistent with the (divinely inspired) early Hebrew precepts and traditions. The Anglo-Saxon sentiment of reverence for law in the abstract is invoked in aid of such Sunday enactments, and many disputants do not hesitate to characterize their violation as *malum in se*, placing the offender in the category of criminals, and justifying the employment against him of all recognized police agencies for the detection and punishment of a felony. In this they are surely quite as sincere as Cotton Mather and his disciples in the enforcement of the command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live"; or as the slaveholders in their vindication of the Divine curse of Canaan.

This is not the time or place to discuss this curious social, religious, and intellectual phenomenon. That it is merely ephemeral, notwithstanding its firm rooting in the past, no observer of the rapid liberalizing of public opinion of the last half-century can deny. Doubtless our successors fifty years hence will learn with amazement that within the last decade of the nineteenth century an enlightened American State had upon its statute-books a law which provided that "every person who shall . . . engage in any sport or recreation on Sunday, between sunrise and sunset, shall be fined not more than four dollars nor less than one dollar."[1] The attempt to prohibit the sale of flowers and soda-water, as well as the amusement of fishing or playing golf on Sunday, will no doubt strike the same historical investigator very much as the laws against certain "Popish rites," in the early Plymouth colony, strike us to-day. From the point of view of the liberal-minded American, and more especially the one of German birth or descent, the New York Sunday raids were therefore utterly unjustifiable; and that the political effect would be far-reaching was soon evident. The danger that the cause of municipal reform would be confounded with the Sunday raid became apparent, and it is a significant fact that no political convention for the nomination of candidates for the city election openly indorsed the new policy. A change in the law was demanded by all, and it was perfectly understood that

[1] Laws of Connecticut, title XIX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that change should be in the direction of liberality, although a *referendum* on the maintenance of the present policy was perhaps most frequently advocated.

When the so-called "Fusion" ticket against Tammany was nominated, great care was taken to avoid any indorsement of the course of the Police Commissioners, and it was hoped that under these circumstances the German-American friends of good government might be induced to defeat Tammany once more. These hopes were doomed to disappointment, and although it was known that great bitterness of feeling existed against the new policy, the formal indorsement of Tammany Hall by the German-American Reform Union came as a clap of thunder out of a clear sky to all who had counted upon continued assistance from that quarter in the struggle for purer city government. It may be said with truth that no greater blow to the prestige of German-Americans as friends of good government under all circumstances has ever been dealt. From the point of view of practical politics it was a blunder worse than a crime, for by it the German-Americans ran into the danger of almost, if not quite, losing the sympathy of the one great political body which had the power, as well as the inclination, to modify the law in a liberal sense,—the great body of liberal-minded Republicans. It made all the friends of German ideals of freedom and social progress grieve, and furnished their detractors with the most available catchwords and arguments. Accordingly, on the platform and in the press, "beer," "Sunday beer," the "beer and delicatessen party," and similar terms, were freely applied to the aims and principles of that entire section of the community which in truth, at this particular juncture, represented truly American ideals at least as faithfully as any other. It was hard to blame any one for thinking that the larger portion, at least, of the German-Americans set the enjoyment of their Sunday beer above their regard for law and order and for decency in local government; and yet it would be rank injustice to the great mass of German-Americans in New York city to assert this view. The great fact remains that the platform of the Fusionists, while it did not indorse the Sunday raid and the spy system, failed to condemn them as vigorously as many German-Americans —to whom the whole question was one of principle—condemned them in their own minds. The desire for complete harmony of thought and action, to which allusion has been made before, was therefore not gratified to its fullest extent by a vote for the Fusion ticket. On the other hand, many conscientious voters believed that a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tammany victory this year, when the offices to be filled were few and comparatively unimportant, with the practical assurance of further Tammany victories to come, provided the obnoxious and unjustifiable administrative policy was continued, would do more to clear the atmosphere, and to ensure a modification of the law, than any thing else which could happen.

The writer has nothing to say in defence or extenuation of this view, so far as it led any honest man to vote for the Tammany ticket; but a regard for fairness and historical truth requires that the motives of conscientious citizens—quiet, sober, law-abiding, and church-going German-Americans—should be emphasized quite as much as that of the handful of beery politicians whose noise and impertinence is in inverse ratio to their right to speak for their fellow-countrymen. Nor is the explanation any more tenable that the indorsement of Tammany by the Reform Union was the result of a corrupt deal; and while a readiness to enter into a deal on the part of many so-called "leaders," both of the Germans and of Tammany, may perhaps be assumed, the idea that it was really consummated by the Reform Union shows an utter misconception of the attitude of the average German-American voter toward his so-called leaders. Envy (that peculiar German vice) and the passion for individualism (which led Bismarck to say that where four Germans are assembled five political opinions may be found) exist in the German-American as much as in his cousins in the Fatherland, and make anything like political hero-worship or even moderate party discipline almost impossible. The vote which was cast, and which elected the Tammany ticket, was certainly guided in many instances by purely material—not to say brutal—instincts; but the large majority of votes came from citizens who condemned the attitude of the Reform administration as a matter of principle, quite as sincerely, and with quite as pure motives, as are to be found in their adversaries shouting for an "American Sabbath,"—meaning, in the minds of each politician, a Sunday on which the saloons are closed *in some other place*. *Noblesse oblige:* the Reform administration could not with impunity use methods which seemed appropriate to Tammany, especially in view of the distinct condemnation of just such methods by the mayor in his speeches before election. The answer is indeed complete that all this did not justify the restoration of Tammany; but, so long as human nature is unchanged, it will be harder to forgive friends than enemies for real injuries, and a present wrong will be more acutely felt than the remote advantages of political consistency.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Had the great mass of German voters in New York city been convinced that a vote for the Fusion ticket did not mean, and would not be interpreted as, an indorsement of the weekly saloon raid, with its attendant features of spies and informers, their votes would have defeated Tammany as decidedly as in 1894. It was the fatal weakness of the rival organization and its leaders, that they did not with sufficient emphasis condemn the administrative blundering of which the deplorable situation of the last campaign was only the inevitable result. Thus an impression of disingenuousness—unjust but real—was created, which even the noble and eloquent appeals of Mr. Carl Schurz could not wholly remove.

In the interior of New York State the German vote remained true to the Republican party. The principal cause of this was no doubt a regard for honesty and efficiency in government, and abhorrence of the Democratic "machine,"—causes which led to equal or greater Republican majorities elsewhere. The Sunday question was not taken seriously. Despite the clap-trap contained in the platform, and some unimportant speeches about the "American Sabbath," the Republican party was trusted as the true party of progress and liberality under the law. Had it been otherwise, it may be doubted whether even the great Republican tidal wave could have saved the ticket; and nothing can be more certain in politics than that, in the absence of such a tidal wave, a policy of continued hypocrisy, cowardice, and pharisaism will bring the party to grief.

Perhaps the most encouraging feature of the election was the absolute proof afforded of the fact that, without this unexpected succor, Tammany was in a small minority in the city. Nothing can convert this minority into a majority in the important municipal elections to be held a year or two hence, except a continuance of the policy of oppression in the interests of Sabbatarianism; and it should be understood by the friends of good government that it is immaterial whether that policy be the result of mistaken conscientiousness or of hypocrisy.

The events of the last summer have accomplished one thing. The Sunday question has been made a live issue,—so live, in fact, that, notwithstanding its immense majorities all over the country, the Republican party cannot safely ignore it. Let it be repeated once more,—the German-Americans want no "Continental Sunday" of unbridled license. They are perfectly willing to be guided by the experience of that country (England) which of all others, as a nation, "keeps holy the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sabbath day," and which permits the open sale of stimulants during certain hours on Sunday, in the interests of labor and morality. That such a law will be passed in New York sooner or later scarcely admits of doubt, and the question is simply how far the legislature of 1896 will have the moral courage to go in that direction. The issue between fanaticism and liberalism, between progress and retrogression, is clearly drawn; and should it ever become national,—a result which is not impossible, and which would be very deplorable for many reasons,—the American citizens of German birth or descent are undoubtedly in a position where they can hold the balance of power between the contending parties. Their inclination is clearly toward the Republican party, and to retain their support, and with it national as well as local ascendency, the party need not stoop to conquer. It need not have the slightest fear of attempted dictation in the interest of individual ambition, of "foreign ideas," or of "un-American" legislation. Blood is thicker than water, and the kinship in race, law, language, manners, and moral characteristics which even fourteen hundred years of separation have not been able wholly to efface, will surely assert itself more and more as the inevitable re-amalgamation of the races increases. Meanwhile, all that makes for mutual confidence and respect, as well as for better understanding of each other's peculiarities and true motives, is a contribution, however insignificant, to the welfare of the country. So far as the Republican party is concerned, all that is necessary for its continued success is that, both in its national policy and in its local administration, it be true to itself and its early ideals,—liberty, honesty, and efficiency in government, and that highest and truest development of all which is best in our national character and aspirations, which patriots fondly call "Americanism."

FREDERICK WILLIAM HOLLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FEDERAL CENSUS.

THE Eleventh Census is practically out of the way. The volumes of reports relating to it that are yet unpublished will come from the Government Printing Office as rapidly as possible, but for all purposes of experience as to methods, cost, and scope, it is finished. In the past, when a census has been completed, all interest in it has ceased until within a brief period prior to a subsequent enumeration. Herein lies the chief reason for delays, great expense, and unsatisfactory results. So, with the experience of the Eleventh Census fresh in mind, it seems wise to call attention to the Twelfth Census, with a view to understanding not only what is essential, but also the necessity for immediate action so far as legislation is concerned.

There are fourteen countries whose governments have provided, either by their constitutions or through legislative enactment, for the periodical enumeration of the population. With one exception a census will be taken in each of these fourteen countries either in 1900 or in 1901; namely, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States in 1900; France, Great Britain, Italy, and Norway in 1901, and Holland in January, 1899. Thus the leading countries of the world will open the new century with a new enumeration of their people.

It has long been the desire of statisticians to secure some uniformity throughout the world in these enumerations. The International Statistical Congress, which met for the first time in 1853, and at intervals afterward, undertook to accomplish something in the way of obtaining uniform census statistics, but it was unsuccessful. There is now an association bearing the name of the International Statistical Institute, whose membership is limited to one hundred and fifty, comprising the leading official statisticians in the world, but which also admits to membership those outside of official positions who have distinguished themselves as statisticians. This Institute meets biennially. Its last session was held in Berne in August, 1895, when unanimous action was taken toward securing uniformity in certain respects in the census inquiries to be made in 1900. For this purpose the Institute charged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a special committee (composed of members who in their respective countries are charged with census duties) with the task of studying the question and making a report at the next session, to be held in 1897. The duties of this committee are: to seek and consider information regarding the most convenient date to recommend for a universal census; to determine and put into proper form the various important questions of general interest which may thereafter obtain a place upon the schedules of a universal census; to define with precision the terms used in the schedules of the enumeration, in order to avoid all ambiguity and to obtain uniform and identical information; and to inform the members of the Institute as to the best manner of procuring an understanding, as early as 1898, among the various states interested. In the opinion of the Institute the uniform questions to be chosen for adoption should everywhere be asked in the same manner, and the terms used should have the same signification, in order to obtain exact results. It was particularly pointed out that the chief question which would necessitate international agreement related to occupations.

The scope of the United States census is much wider than that of any of the countries involved in the proposed universal census, and it collects information not only on the lines which should be brought into uniformity, but upon many others. There is no reason, therefore, why it should not enter into any judicious arrangement whereby the form of the questions which are common to the censuses of all the countries shall be determined, and to this end the officer in charge of the Eleventh Census is making a preliminary study for the use of the committee of the International Statistical Institute. Something more, however, is essential. The Congress of the United States should consider this matter at as early a date as possible. The United States cannot now take the lead in this idea of uniformity, but it can and should take the lead in official action upon it, for our government was the first to establish by law a periodical census, and we have been the leading nation in the expansion of census inquiries. For this reason, therefore, if for no other, there should be early legislation; and there is no doubt as to the prompt action of Congress, for it has ever taken a lively interest in census work. Irrespective of these considerations, however, there is a much more important reason why there should be early legislation, and this relates to the preparation for the Twelfth Census without regard to the action of other countries.

There have been three fundamental Census Acts. The first six censuses of the United States were taken under the Act of March 1, 1790,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with amendments and extensions thereof. This Act was very brief and simple in its provisions. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth censuses were taken under the Act of May 23, 1850, with some modifications at each census period. This Act went more into detail, and marked a departure in census-taking in this country. There was a considerable expansion of the inquiries; but under the law the attempts to secure industrial statistics, or those relating to the products of the country, were not entirely satisfactory. Prior to the census of 1850 such attempts had been practically failures. The Tenth and Eleventh censuses were taken substantially according to the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1879,—a radical departure from any previous legislation, and the census was greatly expanded in its comprehensiveness.

It is significant that all the Acts have been passed just previous to the enumeration, and in hardly any instance has sufficient time for proper preparation been given. We need not consider the remote censuses. Taking the Ninth Census,—that of 1870,—which was carried out in accordance with the Act of 1850, we find sufficient tardiness in legislation to account for many things which have been the subject of the severest criticism. March 24, 1869, Mr. Garfield introduced a bill to provide for taking the Ninth and subsequent censuses, —a measure intended to make improvements indicated by previous experience. This bill passed the House of Representatives April 6, 1869, but was defeated in the Senate. So the Ninth Census was taken under the law substantially as passed in 1850, but the pendency of legislation delayed all action, on the part of the proper officers of the government, for the vast preparations necessary for the enumeration.

The legislation for the Tenth Census—that of 1880—was initiated May 20, 1878, by the introduction of a bill by Mr. Garfield, but nothing came of that effort. January 7, 1879, Mr. Cox, of New York, introduced a bill for taking the Federal census of 1880. A substitute for this bill was reported the same month by Mr. Cox from the Select Committee on the Census, and on the same day Senator Morrill, of the Senate Committee on the Tenth Census, reported the same bill in the Senate. This bill, substantially as reported, became a law March 3, 1879, and the census of 1880 was taken in accordance with its provisions, although, strangely enough, some important amendments, without which the census could not have been taken properly, were made in an act approved as late as April 20, 1880, while the main appropriations for the Tenth Census were not made until the passage of a bill June 16, 1880, two weeks subsequent to the commencement of the work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The legislation providing for the Eleventh Census—that of 1890—was started on its course January 4, 1888, when Mr. Cox introduced a bill for taking the Eleventh and subsequent censuses. This bill was substantially the Act of March 3, 1879, so far as system and principles were concerned. It embodied some new features of census-taking, and undertook the correction of some of the faults of previous legislation; but for scope, system, and methods it was practically the law of 1879. Mr. Cox's bill, with some amendments, was passed by the House of Representatives July 11, 1888, at an evening session. The bill had been before the House six months. I have been informed that the Committee on Census of the House of Representatives never had a session to consider the bill in full, and at the time of its passage, one exceedingly hot night, there were but twenty-seven members of the House present. It was received in the Senate July 13, 1888, toward the close of the session, and became a law March 1, 1889. In addition, legislation making provision on the population schedule for certain inquiries concerning the ownership of homes and farms was not approved until February 22, 1890, barely three months before the enumerators commenced their work.

It should be remembered that the enumerations have been made as of June 1 of the census year in each decade, yet in 1870, 1880, and 1890 the officers charged with the enumeration had but little over a year under the laws in which to make the vast preparations necessary for the census, and in 1880, as stated, nothing could be done of any great moment until after the amendments of April 20, 1880. These delays have been costly in every respect. They cannot be charged to Congress, nor to any one else specifically, because there is no officer of the government whose duty it is to watch the affairs of the census and to see to it that the proper measures are brought before Congress, and at the proper time for securing the best results, or, in fact, for securing any results. So the initiative has been left almost to chance. The census, as such, goes out of existence when the work of each decennial census has been completed, and there is no officer, as stated, whose especial duty it is to call the attention of the legislative branch of the government to the necessities of the case. The necessity for such an officer clearly appears when we consider the stages of the work.

There are three great stages in every census: first, the collection of material; second, its tabulation and analysis; third, its publication. The first and second involve the great labor and expense of the census. The first should not be undertaken, even, until the second is not only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoroughly understood but carefully and completely outlined. No officer should be allowed to enter upon the work of the collection of the raw material for census reports until he has a complete plan from the beginning to the end. Unless this rule is laid down by law, future censuses will be as expensive and as unsatisfactory in many respects as have been some of the past. No officer should be held responsible for great cost, for long delays, or for any inaccuracies when compelled to work as superintendents of the past censuses have worked. The collection of the material involves all the plans necessary therefor: the division of the country into proper districts of supervision; the division of the supervisors' districts into proper enumeration-districts; and the preparation of all blanks, instructions, and paraphernalia for the use of supervisors and enumerators. The officer in charge of the census should outline beforehand, as already stated, all classifications and tables necessary for the final tabulation and analysis of the material collected,—a task for which he should have at least two years in which to perfect his plans. This may seem an extravagant estimate of the time required, but when the great variety of the industries, business interests, etc., of the country is considered, the statement becomes reasonable. The preparation of blanks for the collection of facts relative to population would require a less time, perhaps; but the schedules for the collection of manufacturing, agricultural, mining, and other statistics relating to the material wealth and the welfare of the country require not only great care, but the consultation of experts in all the various industries involved. Furthermore, the officer charged with a census should study the methods and systems in vogue in other countries. If England, France, Germany, or any other country has adopted methods of collecting or tabulating material whereby time is saved, or better, clearer, and more satisfactory results secured, the United States should take cognizance of them and incorporate them in its own census work. All this preparation should be done under the direct personal care and supervision of the superintendent himself. He should delegate but little of this work to clerical assistants. He should have the services of the best statisticians of the country, and, if time be allowed by law, the outcome of his labors would be schedules harmoniously constructed with a view to securing the very best results,—a thing never yet attained in any census in this country.

Under the legislation of the past the superintendent has been obliged to rush into the work, to hurry up the printers, and to drive everybody engaged in the task. The lack of time for proper prepara-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion has been found one of the greatest drawbacks to census-taking. It has been the cause of more than half the complaints and criticisms concerning the work, and to a considerable extent the long delay in the final publication of the census reports can be traced to it. In the Eleventh Census there was barely time between the enacting of the final legislation (in February, 1890) and the first Monday in June (on which day the enumeration had by law to begin) to print and ship to the enumerators more than twenty million schedules and the necessary blanks. In many cases the outfit of forms reached the enumerator only a day or a few hours before his work should begin, giving him little or no time in which to familiarize himself with the inquiries to be made on the various schedules and the printed instructions concerning them. Furthermore, the subdivision of the supervisors' districts into enumeration-districts—which by law was made by the census supervisors subject to the approval of the superintendent—could not always be made and the papers transmitted to Washington in time for proper inspection prior to approval; and in several cases these subdivisions were approved without any inspection whatever. This was also largely true with respect to the appointment of the enumerators. For want of time not much more than a hasty examination, if any at all, could be made of the lists of persons recommended for appointment as enumerators, together with their written applications and indorsements as to their honesty, intelligence, and ability to do the work; so that these lists were practically approved in bulk by the superintendent, in several cases lists which did not reach the Census Office until after the appointment of the enumerators and the commencement of their work being approved by telegraph.

Another very important reason why plenty of time should be given for preparation is found in the matter of ascertaining the distribution of population by civil divisions, the enumeration of which in the last census was attended by the conditions just noted, and which entailed a vast amount of correspondence with supervisors and enumerators after their work was finished, and oftentimes with county clerks and other local officers, in order to determine the boundaries of smaller areas and the population comprised within them. This information should be in the possession of the census officers prior to the enumeration itself, so that proper subdivisions of the country into enumeration-districts, based upon such information, could be made by the Census Office, and specific instructions given to each enumerator as to the various incorporated places or other subdivisions included in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

district for which a separate return of population should be made. The people grow more exacting under each census, and the population of hamlets, villages, and other minor civil divisions is required; but without previous information the Census Office is often at a loss to know what constitutes one of these divisions. As a consequence of the lack of this information, the greatest source of trouble in the tabulation of the returns of the Eleventh Census was to determine the population of incorporated places included within the limits of the primary divisions of counties. In hundreds of cases no statement as to the population of such places could be made in the final report.

Could the plans for the use of material be considered in connection with those for the collection thereof, much expense, annoyance, and criticism would be avoided; but unless this is accomplished, and harmony is secured by one mind passing upon all points, there will be incongruity in the whole work. These considerations are based on the supposition that the standard set by the Tenth and Eleventh Censuses, under the supervision of General Walker and Mr. Porter, respectively, will in no wise be lowered, that their comprehensiveness will not be lessened, and that the demands of the public will increase; and these considerations constitute the second great reason why early and prompt attention should be given to legislation providing for the Twelfth Census.

The third reason for early legislation lies in the fact that in all probability a permanent Census Office will be established. It hardly seems necessary to state any reasons for such an establishment, but some of the principal ones may be given. By the establishment of a permanent office its chief would always be on the lookout for improvements in methods for the collection and tabulation of census data; he would always be informed of what was going on in other countries; he would understand the necessity for legislation by Congress and be in a position to point it out; he would be enabled to avoid all the difficulties which have just been enumerated that are attributable to delays; he would be ready, when he approached the census year and month, to proceed in an orderly and systematic manner; he would avoid crowding into a week what should take a month or three months to do; he would have his work all laid out, his plans perfected from start to finish, a trained force as a nucleus at all times, men skilled through experience to assist him, and harmony secured in all methods of tabulation and presentation through his ability to pass upon them himself.

From a purely business point of view no other reasons need be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given, but there are other considerations of equal importance. Under the present system, or rather lack of system, the superintendent is expected during the census year to collect a vast amount of material. The population must be enumerated; the account of the products of manufactures and of agriculture taken; the facts collected as to the fisheries, mineral products, transportation, insurance, wealth, debt, taxation, home indebtedness, churches, schools, Indians, and all the other subjects named in the existing census laws. The result of the attempt to collect the information relating to these great subjects is literally to "snow under" the Census Office, and it is almost an impossibility to get out from under the crush. The attempt results in the beginning of many pieces of work which must be suspended or even abandoned; it results in variety instead of uniformity in forms and methods; it prevents the superintendent, however skilled as a statistician or an administrative officer, from attending to anything thoroughly and well; it results in vast expense through sending agents over the country on different errands; and, worst of all, despite all efforts, nothing is brought out promptly or within a reasonable time. To be sure, under the last two censuses, bulletins of important facts were sent to the public with very great promptness, but to compile, tabulate, and analyze the information filling twenty-five huge quarto volumes is a task which might well stagger any man.

Another bad effect of the present method of doing business is the necessity of bringing together a large temporary clerical force without a nucleus of skilled clerks to influence the whole body. This results in delay, poor service, and a vast expenditure of money for corrections. A temporary force does not work as industriously as a permanent one. Each member understands that the better he works the sooner he will be out of a job; and while the integrity of the census force cannot be impugned, there is nevertheless a silent influence which works to the disadvantage of the Treasury.

All these difficulties would be corrected and avoided by the establishment of a permanent Census Office, and, above all, the information would be brought out more promptly, and of an improved quality; for under a permanent system of census-taking the work now crowded into the first few years of each decennial period would be extended over the whole period. By the Constitution the enumeration of the people must be taken each ten years, and on or before June 1 of the census years; so the enumerators must travel over the country for this purpose. While doing it they should be called upon to collect infor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mation on schedules having but few inquiries relating to agriculture and manufactures. All the topics heretofore treated by the censuses could be distributed over the remainder of each ten years, in some cases dropped entirely, or in others postponed, while in others still they could be taken up more frequently. It would be convenient and economical to make brief inquiries relative to agriculture and manufactures, as stated, but the account of agriculture and manufactures should be taken every year,—or once in two or three years, perhaps. For some of the topics information once in fifteen or twenty years would be ample, but with the Census Office relieved in the way indicated there should be no reason for much delay in bringing out the results in each case.

The organization of a permanent Census Office should be effected under civil-service regulations. Its nucleus organization should be comparatively small, and its annual cost of maintenance, as such, limited. Aside from a competent head, it should consist only of the necessary clerks and employees to attend to its purely administrative functions, and a force of trained experts and experienced clerks of the higher grades to carry on the constant statistical part of the work. Every ten years, when the enumeration of the population is made, a large temporary force would have to be added to the permanent force; but the two forces should be absolutely independent of each other so far as appointment to them is concerned. The persons comprising each should be secured through civil-service competitive or special examination, or by transfer if within the classified service; but transfer from the temporary to the permanent force should be restricted and made in accordance with civil-service regulations, and then only under certain contingencies which should be clearly defined. I am perfectly well satisfied that had the Eleventh Census been taken under conditions of permanency the cost would have been at least two million dollars less than it has been, and the results would have been finished and before the public in complete form at least a year prior to the present time.

The objection may be raised that a permanent Census Office would involve too much expense, or an expense much greater than has already been applied to the work. A little examination of the subject, however, leads to a different conclusion. The last three censuses have been the most comprehensive. The census of 1870 cost in the aggregate $3,336,511; that for 1880 cost $5,862,750. The amount already appropriated for the Eleventh Census is $11,271,500, and this can be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken as its cost, no further appropriation being necessary, except, it may be, for printing and binding a very few of the final reports. If, now, there should be a permanent Census Office established, it should be on a basis of comprehensive work each year, and of the great work of the enumeration of the people and the account of agriculture and manufactures every tenth year. A reasonable appropriation for seven years consecutively for permanent work would leave a margin—taking the cost of the Eleventh Census as a guiding-point—ample in every respect for the decennial work.

There is no question as to the advisability of securing, in some way, a very material reduction in the amount of work given to the ordinary census enumerator. Every effort should be made to obtain complete and accurate data concerning population, both as to the care and thoroughness with which the enumerator canvasses his district, and the completeness of the answers to the inquiries made concerning each person enumerated; but such questions are substantially dependent upon a house-to-house canvass, and they cannot be obtained readily in any other way. The work of the enumerator is now so increased through the multiplicity of inquiries that it is almost impossible for him to be faithful in his work and at the same time secure reasonable compensation: but by spreading the present work over ten years; by instituting a closer supervision of enumerators; by increasing the number of supervisors; and by making some preliminary examination of the enumerators selected, as was done in Massachusetts preparatory to the census just taken in that State,—it is believed that great improvement can be secured, not only as to the quality of the work done, but in the time necessary to do it. There should be ample preliminary instruction of the supervisors and enumerators, and they should be made familiar with their work before they enter upon it. This desirable result can be secured only by having ample time for preparation. The fact that very many of the enumerators find, after appointment, that it is impossible for them to carry on the work and at the same time secure proper remuneration therefor, and are thus led to throw up their commissions, compels the Census Office to make other appointments without due consideration of the qualifications of candidates. More expense in the supervision and instruction of supervisors and enumerators would result in a great decrease of the expense necessary for the correction of crude and bungling work.

The Senate on the 16th of February, 1891, by resolution, directed the Secretary of the Interior to consider the expediency of the estab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lishment of a permanent Census Bureau, and to embody the result of his consideration in a report to be made at the opening of the Fifty-second Congress, such report to include a draft of a bill should the Secretary consider it expedient. Under this resolution the Superintendent of the Census, Hon. Robert P. Porter, made a very elaborate report, through the Secretary, to the Senate. This report is known as "Executive Document No. 1, Fifty-second Congress, 1st Session," and was forwarded December 7, 1891. It is an exceedingly valuable document, and gives in full all the reasons why a permanent Census Office should be established. It also gives the testimony of a very large number of statisticians, churchmen, representatives of commercial organizations, commissioners of agriculture, officers of boards of health, officers of institutions, and officers of State bureaus of statistics.

The House of Representatives also took up the question of a permanent Census Bureau, and directed the Select Committee on the Eleventh Census to inquire into the expediency of establishing such an office. This committee made a report, known as "Report No. 2393, Fifty-second Congress, 2d Session"; and as a result of the hearings which this committee gave, and of the evidence which it collected, a bill providing for a permanent census service was reported unanimously. This bill, however, was never acted upon, but it is especially noticeable that in the consideration of these two reports there was no opposition on the part of any one to the establishment of such an office: on the other hand, every one indorsed it heartily and emphatically.

The point now made is that if a permanent Census Office is to be established at all, the initiative legislation looking to that result should be taken without delay; for under such legislation whoever might be placed at the head of such an office would have ample opportunity to study the whole question and to report to Congress full and comprehensive plans for future census work. There are these three reasons, then, for prompt legislation: the action looking to the unification of certain inquiries in the various censuses of the world for 1900; the necessity of preparation for the Twelfth Census; the desire to establish a permanent Census Office. In considering these three reasons there is no necessity of indulging in any criticisms, for all criticism must come back to the fact that there has been no one whose particular duty it was to see to it that proper preparations were made, not only for legislation, but for the real work of the census.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S LETTERS.[1]

"It has ever been a hobby of mine, though perhaps it is a truism, not a hobby, that the true life of a man is in his letters."

So wrote John Henry Newman to his sister thirty-two years ago. Truisms, like paradoxes, must be taken with a grain of salt. Newman's own letters hardly bear out his own theory. Less than the Apology, less than the Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England (1851), less even than some of the famous sermons, such as the sermon on the Parting of Friends, are they the man. "Biographers," says Dr. Newman, "varnish, they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh's nods, but contemporary letters are facts." Letters are conclusive evidence of the fact that they were written, but not necessarily of the facts which they allege. If some letters are the most natural, others are the most artificial of all human compositions. They may be written with the fear that they will be published, or with the fear that they will not. Mr. Chamberlain addressed a private letter on a public question to the editor of a newspaper. Cicero, in one of his letters to Atticus, explains that he would not have expressed himself with so much freedom if he had not felt confident that his words would never be read by any other human eyes. But if Newman's remarks are true of any one, they are true of Matthew Arnold. His letters are, if possible, more natural than his conversation. In his witty, genial, and delightful talk there was a serio-comic pretence which people with no humor mistook for affectation. His friendly, chatty, confidential letters combine the simplicity of a child with all the mental and imaginative resources of a scholar, a poet, a philosopher, and a man of the world. Mr. Arnold's family had either to deprive the public of what, apart from enjoyment, it must do every one good to read, or to run the risk of spoiling the letters by cutting out much that was most private and therefore most characteristic. Very few letters could have endured

[1] "Letters of Matthew Arnold," 1848–1888, collected and arranged by George W. E. Russell. 2 vols. Macmillan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the severe process of excision and retrenchment to which these have been exposed. But Mrs. Arnold has rightly judged that they could stand even such a test. If she has erred at all, it is in the too scrupulous removal of affectionate references to herself.

No praise can be too high for the manner in which Mr. George Russell has discharged his task as editor. He has unhappily felt himself bound, by Mr. Arnold's expressed wish on the subject, to abstain from anything like a biographical narrative; and the letters are left to tell their own story, which it was not their purpose to do. But in a brief Prefatory Note he describes, with the knowledge of an intimate friend and the skill of a literary artist, the genuine character of Matthew Arnold. I was one of those who attended a meeting held in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey soon after Mr. Arnold's death, to arrange some fitting memorial of his poetic genius and his public service. Some of the most distinguished men in England were there, and addressed the audience. There were the Dean of Westminster, Lord Coleridge, Mr. Jowett of Balliol, the fifteenth Earl of Derby, and Archbishop Thomson, all of whom are now gone except the Dean. To the eloquence of the speeches any testimonial from me would be impertinent. But what must have struck every one who heard them was the deep personal feeling of irreparable loss that inspired them all—a feeling so strong that words were quite inadequate to do it justice. All the speakers were men of great intellectual power, fully appreciative of Mr. Arnold's poetry and criticism. But it was the moral beauty—the "nobility," as Mr. Jowett called it—of his life upon which they almost exclusively dwelt. He was indeed a good man in the best sense of that term. As Mr. Russell says with equal insight and force, he was "gentle, generous, enduring, laborious; a devoted husband, a most tender father, an unfailing friend." The sort of biography to which Cardinal Newman referred has become altogether obsolete since 1863. It used to be said that the only "Lives" worth reading were those of actors, because they were not supposed to be respectable and so their biographers did not mind telling the truth about them. Times have changed indeed. Actors are now more respectable, or at least more respected, than bishops; and the new school of biography, which will always be associated with the name of Mr. Froude, aims at nothing less than the canonization of what I once heard a lady call the biographee. Mr. Arnold's memory, though it is to be spared that ordeal, would have nothing to fear from it. "Whatever record leap to light, he never shall be shamed."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those who knew him best loved him most. He was a saint in his family, a hero to his publisher, and the idol of his friends.

At a dinner of old Balliol men, held when, for the first and last time in this century, there was a really great Primate of the English Church, Matthew Arnold had to return thanks for the toast of his health. He followed Archbishop Tait, an admirable speaker as well as a great statesman, and remarked with exquisite urbanity that after such an impressive performance it might perhaps refresh the company to see a Balliol man who had not got on in the world. The writer of the descriptive report which appeared in the next day's "Times" translated this into the rather coarse paraphrase: "Mr. Matthew Arnold contrasted his own position and emoluments with those of the Archbishop of Canterbury." But Matthew Arnold's spirit of cheerful content was not the least excellent of his many excellent gifts. Men with a fiftieth part of his natural capacity, who work for themselves, often realize an early competence and an ultimate fortune. Mr. Arnold worked for the country, and much of his leisure was spent in adding, by hook or by crook, to the pittance doled out to him from the Education Department. Matthew Arnold was blessed with the soundest of digestions and the sunniest of tempers. But the secret of his happiness was that self-denial was a pleasure to him when it was endured for the sake of those he loved. He enjoyed living, even in London, and his passion for the country was as strong as Thoreau's. Whether he was at home or abroad, nature interested and charmed him. In the earliest of these letters, written to his mother on the 2d of January, 1848, he says :—

"It was nearly dark when I left the Weybridge Station, but I could make out the wide sheet of the gray Thames gleaming through the general dusk as I came out on Chertsey Bridge. I never go along that shelving gravelly road up towards Laleham without interest, from Chertsey Lock to the turn where the drunken man lay. To-day, after morning church, I went up to Pentonhook, and passed the stream with the old volume, width, shine, rapid fulness, 'kempshott,' and swans, unchanged and unequalled, to my partial and remembering eyes at least."

Although Mr. Arnold was an enthusiastic fisherman and rather fond of shooting, his interest in the country was not primarily that of a sportsman. It was rather the devotion which inspired his favorite modern poet and made him as good an interpreter of Wordsworth as Wordsworth was an interpreter of nature. Of all his critical writings there is none more full of perception, as there is none more characteristic of Matthew Arnold, than the Preface to the Selections from Wordsworth.

A very large number of Matthew Arnold's letters are addressed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his mother, who died in 1873 at the age of eighty-two, having survived her famous husband more than thirty years. Every one knows the poem on Rugby Chapel, and can learn from it that Matthew Arnold revered the memory of his father. His letters to his mother show that his father was rarely out of his thoughts, and he never loses an opportunity of tracing Dr. Arnold's influence upon modern thought. Dr. Arnold is chiefly known as the awful pedagogue of "Tom Brown's School Days." Even in his "Life" by Dean Stanley the literary side of him is too much ignored. It was upon that side that his son delighted to dwell, the side presented in the "History of Rome" and the "Thucydides." Dr. Arnold did not live to complete the "History," which has perhaps suffered from the popular impression that the early annals of Rome are all a myth, that Sir George Cornewall Lewis said so, and that there is no use in bothering about them. But the late Professor Freeman, no mean authority, was an ardent admirer of the book, and considered Dr. Arnold to be a true historian. And if anybody wants not to study the text of Thucydides from the point of minute verbal scholarship, but to read the greatest of all historians with an intelligent guide, he will find Dr. Arnold exactly the guide he wants.

A remarkable proportion of the letters are addressed to members of Mr. Arnold's own family. But perhaps the best of all were written to Mrs. Matthew Arnold when he was travelling. They give all the information which the most anxious wife could require, and they are never trivial or dull. It is certain, both from internal and external evidence, that no idea of publication ever entered the writer's mind. Yet every reader will cordially thank Mrs. Arnold for allowing them to appear. Among his correspondents outside the circle of the Arnolds, Lady de Rothschild must be esteemed peculiarly fortunate. In writing to her Mr. Arnold seems to have been always at his best. That, however, is not surprising. For while there were qualities in Mr. Arnold which irresistibly attracted ladies of every age, there is no one more capable of appreciating at the same time his intellect and his character than that ablest, most accomplished, and most sympathetic of women.

In these *Epistolæ ad Familiares* literature occupies a comparatively small place. Nevertheless there is enough to throw an interesting light upon Mr. Arnold's strength and weakness as a critic. At the so-called Jubilee Dinner of the Oxford Union in 1873, the late Dr. Liddon, in proposing the toast of "Literature," for which Mr. Arnold was to respond, remarked that the great critic had taught them to criticise even himself. Matthew Arnold's satire was never barbed. It left no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rankling wound behind it, and many of his victims were among his warmest admirers. The critical quality in which he most excelled was the invaluable gift of detecting merit below the surface. He liked to praise rather than to blame, as all good critics do. But it may be doubted whether he had the supreme faculty of judgment. He admired more than he imitated Sainte-Beuve. The dullest man cannot read "Essays in Criticism" without having his mind stimulated and his views enlarged. The cleverest man cannot read the "Causeries du Lundi" without feeling chastened and humiliated by that vast learning, that infallible taste, that exquisite lucidity of style, that impregnable fortress of common sense. Writing to his mother from London on the 7th of May, 1848, Matthew Arnold says:—

"I have just finished a German book I brought with me here; a mixture of poems and travelling journal by Heinrich Heine, the most famous of the young German literary set. He has a good deal of power, though more trick; however, he has thoroughly disgusted me. The Byronism of a German, of a man trying to be gloomy, cynical, impassioned, *moqueur*, etc., all *à la fois*, with their honest bonhommistic language and total want of experience of the kind that Lord Byron, an English peer with access everywhere, possessed, is the most ridiculous thing in the world."

Of course this is a private letter, and Matthew Arnold's real view of Heine must be sought in his essay and his poem. But really they are almost as inadequate as this, of which indeed they are chiefly an expansion. The "Reisebilder" contains much that is foolish, and much that is repulsive. But no one would gather from the passage quoted that it was one of the wittiest books ever written, or that it contained one of the most beautiful poems in the world. Heine himself may be said to have acknowledged the difficulty about the language by rewriting the book in French. He certainly never pretended to be an aristocrat, for he dwells frequently on his plebeian origin, and he was a disciple of Sterne rather than of Byron.

"Why is 'Villette' disagreeable?" This question was put by Matthew Arnold to his sister on the 14th of April, 1853. And he answers it himself as follows:—

"Because the writer's mind contains nothing but hunger, rebellion, and rage, and therefore that is all she can, in fact, put into her book. No fine writing can hide this thoroughly, and it will be fatal to her in the long run."

He then proceeds to contrast "Villette" with "My Novel," admitting, with a simplicity which seems not to be feigned, that "Bulwer's nature is not a perfect one either." It certainly was not, even according to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mundane standard of fallen man. But an Oxford scholar like Mr. Arnold should have remembered his Aristotle: ὅτε τὸ διότι. You establish your fact before you inquire into its causes. Dr. Johnson once sat down with Mrs. Hannah More before the outspread Sonnets of Milton to consider why they were so bad. Is "Villette" disagreeable? And what of "Shirley," by the same author? Does that, too, contain nothing but "hunger, rebellion, and rage"? Miss Brontë was a woman of genius, and her genius forced its way through every disadvantage of material circumstances and mental training. Bulwer was a clever, highly cultivated man of the world, with immense industry and consummate skill, enjoying all the advantages of wealth and station, but not possessing a spark of the true inward fire. "Sublime mediocrity" is the utmost that can be said of Bulwer, and Matthew Arnold preferred him to Charlotte Brontë. On the 22d of September, 1864, Mr. Arnold wrote to Mr. Dykes Campbell on the volume of Tennyson's poems containing "Enoch Arden." He was at first inclined to write a review of it, thinking—oddly enough—that "Enoch Arden" was "the best thing Tennyson had done." He gave up the task because he feared that if he depreciated Tennyson he would be suspected of jealousy. He wrote:—

"I do not think Tennyson a great and powerful spirit in any line, as Goethe was in the line of modern thought, Wordsworth in that of contemplation, Byron even in that of passion; and unless a poet, especially a poet at this time of day, is that, my interest in him is only slight, and my conviction that he will not finally stand high is firm."

It is no less doubtless eccentric to put Tennyson below Byron than to put Bulwer Lytton above Miss Brontë.

But there must have been something wrong with a critic who could not appreciate the greatest poet of his own age and country, a man only thirteen years older than himself. May it not be—I speak with diffidence—that Mr. Arnold expected from poetry something which it is not the function of poetry to give? Mr. Arnold did not seem to feel—what as a critic he surely should have felt—that he had to account for Tennyson, to explain how a man who was not "a great and powerful spirit" had leavened the speech of educated men, had become a classic in his lifetime, only less a part of their language than the Bible and Shakespeare. If the true poet must be always setting traps or constructing puzzles, if every poem is to prove or disprove something, then "Tithonus" is not a poem, and Tennyson was not a poet. But if the true office of oetry be to express the great commonplaces of life, the objec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion that Tennyson has not a "line" falls to the ground. What was Homer's "line"? What was Shakespeare's? What was Keats's? They were on their own lines; they were themselves. Even if we take the case of Wordsworth, it is not the argumentative verse of the "Excursion," but such pieces as "A Slumber did my Spirit Seal," that stamp him as the true poet, not merely the metrical philosopher. Lovely and melodious as so much of Matthew Arnold's own poetry is, haunting the memory like a strain of music, he is best when he is simplest: when he draws from nature, as in the "Scholar Gypsy"; or from human experience, as in those magic verses—

> "For each day brings its petty dust
> Our soon choked souls to fill;
> And we forget because we must,
> And not because we will."

If Mr. Arnold liked "metaphysical poetry," he ought to have revelled in Browning. But he did not. His classic taste was shocked, as Tennyson's also was, by the frequent harshness and roughness of that undeniably "powerful spirit." He admired Browning just when Browning left his problems and wrote with true simplicity.

Mr. Arnold was justly proud of the vogue which his pet phrases had, and the readiness with which they were picked up by educated men. "The writing world was," as he said, particularly fond of him. He supplied them with quotations, and they were not ungrateful, as he points out in his inimitable way. He writes to his mother:—

> "I have been amused by getting a letter from Edward Dicey, asking me, in the name of the proprietors of the 'Daily Telegraph,' to give them a notice of Blake the artist, and to name my own price. I sent a civil refusal, but you may depend upon it Lord Lytton was right in saying that it is no inconsiderable advantage to me that all the writing world have a kind of weakness for me, even at the time they are attacking me."

Afterwards he wrote a good deal for the "Pall Mall Gazette" when Mr. John Morley was its editor, and his objection to anonymous writing, which had been very strong, disappeared. Mr. Disraeli congratulated him on the popularity of "Philistines," "Sweetness and Light," and the rest of them. This was a real compliment coming from a master of many phrases, and highly appreciated. But this sort of success was really valuable less in itself than as a proof that his books were read. "Philistines" is from the German, "Sweetness and Light" from Swift. The description of Oxford at the end of the Preface to "Essays in Criticism" was his own, and will be read with pleasure, like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Dover Beach," while the English language endures. There is nothing more interesting in these pages than the account of Mr. Arnold's conversation with Mr. Disraeli at Aston Clinton, the late Sir Anthony de Rothschild's house in Buckinghamshire. Mr. Disraeli, who unaffectedly liked and admired men of letters, and whose sense of humor never slumbered, was at his best with Matthew Arnold. With him he was not only courteous, as he was not always, but simple and sincere, as he was seldom. Those who have read Mr. Disraeli's beautiful speech in the House of Commons on the death of Cobden, quoted in Mr. Morley's biography, will find that on this occasion he expressed the same opinion in private. "He was born a statesman, and his reasoning is always like a statesman's, and striking." Being reminded that he had met Mr. Arnold some years before, Mr. Disraeli said:—

"'Ah, yes, I remember. At that time I had a great respect for the name you bore, but you yourself were little known. Now you are well known. You have made a reputation, but you will go further yet. You have a great future before you, and you deserve it.'"

Could anything have been better said? Having acknowledged the compliment, Mr. Arnold referred to Mr. Disraeli's abandonment of literature for politics.

"'Yes,' he replied, 'one does not settle these things for one's self, and politics and literature both are very attractive; still, in the one, one's work lasts, and in the other it doesn't.' He went on to say that he had given up literature because he was not one of those people who can do two things at once, but that he admired most the men like Cicero, who could."

There is no "Life" of Lord Beaconsfield except Mr. Froude's little book, and there probably never will be. But among all the scattered notices of that eminent and extraordinary man in the political memories of his generation, I do not know one which exhibits him in so attractive a light as does this spontaneous and contemporaneous letter from Matthew Arnold to his mother.

When Mr. Arnold returned from the United States full of delight at the unbounded courtesy and hospitality with which he had been received, he told with glee and gusto a story of the late Mr. Barnum. The great showman, he said, had invited him to his house in the following terms: "You, sir, are a celebrity. I am a notoriety. We ought to be acquainted." "I could n't go," he added, "but it was very nice of him." The letters do not deal much with the private lives of public men. They are for the most part concerned either with higher or more homely topics. But there is a charming and most characteristic anec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dote of Samuel Wilberforce, the famous Bishop of Oxford, which is too good to be passed over. It occurs in a letter to his mother, dated the 2d of February, 1864, and it refers once more to Aston Clinton a house where he always liked to stay :—

"The Bishop of Oxford had a rather difficult task of it in his sermon, for opposite to him was ranged all the house of Israel, and he is a man who likes to make things pleasant to those he is on friendly terms with. He preached on Abraham, his force of character and his influence on his family; he fully saved his honor by introducing the mention of Christianity three or four times, but the sermon was in general a sermon which Jews as well as Christians could receive. His manner and delivery are well worth studying, and I am very glad to have heard him. A truly emotional spirit he undoubtedly has beneath his outside of society-haunting and men-pleasing, and each of the two lives he leads gives him the more zest for the other. Any real power of mind he has not. Some of the thinking, or pretended thinking, in his sermon was sophistical and hollow beyond belief. I was interested in finding how instinctively Lady de Rothschild had seized on this. His chaplain told me, however, that I had not heard him at his best, as he certainly preached under some constraint."

Neither bishop nor chaplain held the opinion, which a clergyman ought to hold, that the way to be a gentleman is to be a Christian.

There are in these volumes no letters to the late Lord Coleridge, who was perhaps Mr. Arnold's oldest and most intimate friend. They happened to meet in America, and Mr. Arnold describes himself as embarrassed at the unction of the eulogies bestowed upon him in public by the Lord Chief Justice of England. Lord Coleridge was a various man, a great orator, a great social personage, a man of letters even more than of law, an admirable talker, but, above all, a consummate master of irony and sarcasm. A letter from Matthew Arnold to his wife, written in 1854, contains a delicious reference to a review of his own poems by the future Chief Justice :—

"My love to J. D. C. [John Duke Coleridge], and tell him that the limited circulation of the 'Christian Remembrancer' makes the unquestionable viciousness of his article of little importance. I am sure he will be gratified to think that it is so."

This is in the true Coleridgean style, and quite perfect in its way. But of course it must not be taken as an expression of annoyance or resentment. Matthew Arnold was never spiteful, and hardly ever angry. It was his fun, and his fun was always irresistible.

Mr. Arnold's politics are, I suppose, as well known in America as they are here. They were rather French than English. He adopted early in life, and retained to the end, the opinion that his own country was intellectually behind France; that the French were logical whereas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we were not; and that there was a serious danger in the British preference for common sense, or the rule of thumb, to principles and ideas. The sort of prejudice embodied in Mr. Disraeli's celebrated dictum that this country is not governed by logic, but by Parliament, he held to be mischievous clap-trap, if indeed Mr. Disraeli was not laughing in his sleeve. It is curious that with this turn of mind he should have been such an enthusiastic admirer of Burke, with whom the British Constitution was an idol, not to say a fetish. Perhaps he was captivated and carried away by the "grand style" of that splendid and princely writer. However that may be, Mr. Arnold, though he called himself first a Liberal and afterward a Liberal-Unionist, never belonged to any political party. Although he liked Mr. Disraeli in private,—and no wonder,—he called him a charlatan in reference to his public career. In Mr. Gladstone he had no confidence, believing him to be swayed by ecclesiastical bias, at the mercy of fitful enthusiasm, and opposed to real freedom of thought. While he wrote warmly in praise of Burke's attachment to his native land, and pointed out that the liberality of his Irish policy was unaffected by the general reaction of his opinions after 1789, he would not hear of Home Rule. The fact is, that although he took an interest in politics from time to time, and always interested others when he wrote about them, he treated them, as he was well entitled to do, piecemeal and in a desultory fashion. He made too little allowance for men who had to act and to do the best they could with the imperfect means at their disposal. "I hold," he said once, in a sentence printed under the clever caricature of him in "Vanity Fair," "I hold that the critic should keep out of the region of immediate practice." Fortunately for mankind he did not follow his own maxim in poetry. In politics he certainly did. But now and again, with the true critical insight, he drew the mental portrait of a statesman as no one else could have drawn it. In 1870 the University of Oxford, which he loved and served, conferred upon him an honorary degree, and made him, according to the rather absurd form in such cases, a Doctor of Civil Law. Lord Salisbury, as Chancellor of the University, presided at the ceremony, and in Mr. Arnold's opinion performed his part very well. Concerning him Mr. Arnold writes to his mother:—

"He is a dangerous man, though, and chiefly from his want of any true sense and experience of literature and its beneficent function. Religion he knows, and physical science he knows; but the immense work between the two, which is for literature to accomplish, he knows nothing of, and all his speeches

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed this way. On the one hand he was full of the great future for physical science, and begging the University to make up her mind to it, and to resign much of her literary studies; on the other hand he was full—almost defiantly full—of counsels and resolves for retaining and upholding the old ecclesiastical and dogmatic form of religion. From a juxtaposition of this kind nothing but shocks and collisions can come; and I know no one, indeed, more likely to provoke shocks and collisions than men like Lord Salisbury."

All this is profoundly true, though as different as possible from the ordinary praise and abuse of the present Prime Minister. People argue that Lord Salisbury is a man of letters because he can write a good style. They forget that he was a journalist when journalists were required to know the English language. If any one will turn to Lord Salisbury's address, delivered at Oxford as President of the British Association in 1894, he will see how thoroughly Matthew Arnold understood the man. Religious equality has been enforced at Oxford in spite of Lord Salisbury; and religion, being left to its own resources, is more powerful there than it was in the old days of compulsory and conservative orthodoxy. Physical science is amply recognized. But one change there has been which neither Lord Salisbury nor Mr. Arnold in 1870 foresaw,—Oxford has fallen into the hands of the specialists. Philologists and physiologists, historians and lawyers, geologists and theologians, have substituted for the old idea of a liberal education a multitude of narrow and technical schools for cramming the memory and starving the intellect. The old education may have been defective. But at least it was an education, and not an apprenticeship.

When he was in Rome in 1865, Matthew Arnold wrote to his mother:—

"Here in Italy one feels that all time spent out of Italy by tourists in France, Germany, Switzerland, etc., is—human life being so short—time misspent. Greece and parts of the East are the only other places to go to."

Thousands, from Goethe to *Mr. Foker*, must have felt the same about Italy. But Matthew Arnold discovered twenty years later that the West, as well as the East, was worth a visit. His letters from America are naturally more interesting to English than to American readers. One to his younger daughter, now Mrs. Wodehouse, gives a graphic account of the way in which his time was spent. It was written from the Union Club, Chicago, January 21, 1884:—

"We got here late last night. We are staying with a great bookseller, who is also a general and is always called General M'Clurg. He really was made a general in the Civil War, being a brisk and prominent man, but it is odd to address a bookseller as *General*. We arrived at the station at eight in the evening, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drove to his house. After a hasty dinner he hurried me off to a reception at the Literary Club, explaining to me on the way that I should have to make a speech. This was the programme. The hundred members of the club were gathered together when we arrived. The president received me, and then the whole club filed out to supper, I standing by the president and being presented to each member and shaking hands with him as he passed me. The supper-table was splendidly decorated with flowers. I was put in a great chair by the president, and, having just dined, had to go through the whole course from oysters to ice, with plenty of champagne. . . . We have had a week of good houses (I consider myself now as an actor, for my managers take me about with theatrical tickets, at reduced rates, over the railways, and the tickets have *Matthew Arnold troupe* printed on them)."

Mr. Arnold gave the American people of his best. He told Mr. Russell that he would rather be remembered by the lectures he delivered in the United States than by any other of his compositions in prose. He did not altogether like lecturing. He had not been accustomed to addressing large audiences, and he had a good deal of trouble with the management of his voice. But the kindness of his reception was such that, as his letters show, he thoroughly enjoyed himself.

Mr. Russell, in his Prefatory Note to these volumes, expresses the opinion that Matthew Arnold's theology, "once the subject of some just criticism, seems now a matter of comparatively little moment; for indeed his nature was essentially religious." Mr. Russell's Note, as he modestly calls it, is so good that one hesitates to find fault with anything it contains. But this sentence introduces so many controversial questions, and bears so distinctly upon a most significant part of Mr. Arnold's first work, that it cannot be passed over in silence. I respectfully demur to the logic. That Mr. Arnold's nature was essentially religious his life and writings alike prove. But does it follow that because his nature was essentially religious his theology should be a matter of comparatively little moment? That is rather a cynical view of the relation between theology and religion. An irreligious man could never have written "St. Paul and Protestantism," or "Literature and Dogma," or "God and the Bible." Matthew Arnold's theology was not original. It was the theology of Ewald and of Renan, men of great power and learning, who must be refuted by argument and not dismissed with an epithet. By his adroit use of the adjective "just" Mr. Russell disposes of three volumes in one syllable. It seems, however, probable that by Mr. Arnold's theology is meant, not his opinions, but his methods; not his theology proper, but his theological style. A wider issue could hardly be raised. We have all in our youth composed more or less tedious and unprofitable essays upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thesis that ridicule is (or is not) a test of truth. For my part I do not propose to repeat my offence. But it so happens that in one of these very letters Mr. Arnold endeavors to show, with obvious sincerity, that the criticism upon his theological manner was not "just." The passage occurs in a letter to his sister, Miss Arnold. He belonged to a very orthodox family, and in religious matters his foes were those of his own household. In 1874 he writes:—

"There is a levity which is altogether evil; but to treat miracles and the common anthropomorphic ideas of God as what one may lose and yet keep one's hope, courage, and joy, as what are not really matters of life and death in the keeping or losing of them, this is desirable and necessary, if one holds, as I do, that the common anthropomorphic ideas of God and the reliance on miracles must and will inevitably pass away. This I say not to pain you, but to make my position clear to you."

Nobody who reads that passage can doubt that the writer meant every word he wrote, and the irresistible inference is that in all his theological works—if indeed they are to be so designated—he intended to free religion from what he considered injurious to it. The expression which of all that he wrote gave the deepest offence, and which need not be repeated, he withdrew on finding that it had inflicted especial pain upon the distinguished philanthropist who was associated with it. Even in this letter to his sister Mr. Arnold could not refrain from one retaliatory blow at his accusers. "The religious world which complains of me," he says, "would not read me if I treated my subject as they say it ought to be treated." When Samuel Rogers was reproached for saying disagreeable things, he replied: "I have a very low voice, and if I did not say disagreeable things nobody would hear what I said." Some of Mr. Arnold's critics must have been acquainted with Pascal. The profundity of Pascal's genius was only equalled by the fervor of his piety. Yet in his "Provincial Letters," which deal entirely with theological subjects, he exhausts the resources of wit and irony in making the doctrines of the Jesuits ridiculous. Mr. Russell may reply that the doctrines of the Jesuits are false, while the opinions of "the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester" are true. But that is hardly the point.

Many years before Mr. Arnold himself took up religious subjects he fell in with Greg's "Creed of Christendom," and thus wrote of it to his mother in 1863:—

"Greg's mistake lies in representing to his imagination the existence of a great body of people excluded from the consolations of the Bible by the popular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Protestant doctrine of verbal inspiration. That is stuff. The mass of people take from the Bible what suits them, and quietly leave on one side all that does not. He, like so many other people, does not apprehend the vital distinction between religion and criticism."

Those were just the people whom Mr. Arnold's treatment of the Bible especially irritated. They were conventional without being serious. He was serious without being conventional. They took his humor for flippancy because their own flippancy was devoid of humor. The essential connection of humor and reverence can be missed by no student of literature and of life. No one could be more nobly serious than Mr. Arnold, as in his poetry, which is the best and the most enduring part of him. But there are delusions, absurd as well as pernicious, for which laughter is the proper cure. When Voltaire exposed religious persecution to the ridicule and contempt of civilized mankind, he did a real service to religion as well as to humanity. I remember a preacher before the University of Oxford exhorting us to "hold fast to the integrity of our anthropomorphism." I cannot help thinking that a dose of Matthew Arnold would have been good alike for him and for his congregation.

Not that Mr. Arnold was without prejudices. Far from it. He did not like Nonconformists. Referring to James Montgomery, the Moravian hymn-writer, he says: "Of all dull, stagnant, unedifying *entourages*, that of middle-class Dissent, which environed Montgomery, seems to me the stupidest." In his hatred of Dissent and of the middle class Mr. Arnold was at least impartial. For while on the one hand he was a clergyman's son, he certainly belonged to the middle class. He was too fond of classification. He should have remembered his own excellent saying that in England there is no such sharp division between classes as exists in some Continental countries. The middle-class Dissenter does not divide his time between sanding his sugar and saying his prayers. Nor do "aristocrats" all eat off gold plate, fare sumptuously every day, and entertain reasonable doubts of their own paternity. The House of Lords is like a dull and empty House of Commons. The working-men in the House of Commons are much the same as the rest, except that, if anything, they have rather better manners. It is true that when Mr. Arnold thus wrote of Dissent, the Dissenters were excluded from the Universities, or at all events from posts of honor and emolument therein. But Dr. Martineau is a more learned man and a more subtle thinker than Mr. Arnold.

Matthew Arnold never for a moment forgot that he was his father's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son. In 1855, when he was thirty-two, his mother found and sent him a letter of his father's. He acknowledged it in the following terms:—

"I ought before this to have thanked you for sending the letter, which is ennobling and refreshing, as everything which proceeds from him always is, besides the pathetic interest of the circumstances of its writing and finding. I think he was thirty-five when that letter was written; and how he had forecast and revolved, even then, the serious interests and welfare of his children—at a time when, to many men, their children are still little more than playthings! He might well hope to bring up children, when he made that bringing-up so distinctly his thought beforehand; and we who treat the matter so carelessly and lazily—we can hardly expect ours to do more than *grow up* at hazard, not be *brought up* at all. But this is just what makes him great—that he was not only a good man saving his own soul by righteousness, but that he carried so many others with him in his hand and saved them, if they would let him, along with himself."

Dr. Arnold was cut off in the prime of life, leaving his "History of Rome" a fragment, and his work at Rugby incomplete. The true presentment of him is given by Dean Stanley rather than by Judge Hughes. His system of school management he introduced from Winchester, adding only the sermon to the cane. His ideas of political philosophy were much more interesting and remarkable. Like his son, he was considered a heretic by the Scribes and Pharisees of his day. Dr. Stanley, who ought to know, says he was a Broad Churchman. But he held the theory that Church and State were two aspects of the same thing: that the Church was the State on its ecclesiastical side, and that the State was the Church on its political side. Nonconformists were erring brethren, who really belonged to the Church, although they chose to reject its ministrations. But those who were not Christians were outside the State as well as the Church, and, though entitled to protection because they paid taxes, had no right to sit in Parliament, or even to vote. While Matthew Arnold travelled a long way beyond his father's theological ceremonies, and was certainly not opposed to the emancipation of the Jews, he inherited and adopted Dr. Arnold's invincible faith in truth, righteousness, and innocence. No line of his poetry suggests anything but what is lovely and of good report. No act of his life could have been condemned by the puritan rigor of his father. From his father also he derived much of his inbred taste and literary sense. Dr. Arnold's style is always lucid, dignified, and impressive. His mind was steeped in that standard and touchstone of perfection, the literature of Athens. Plato and Thucydides were the favorites of the father; Homer and Sophocles of the son. Greece is justified of her children.

HERBERT WOODFIELD PAUL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REMINISCENCES OF AN EDITOR.

I HAVE been in newspaper work for about thirty years. I have held places of various grades of responsibility on daily journals in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Boston. I have been reporter, correspondent, managing editor. I have assisted the sporting editor, taken assignments from the dramatic critic, and risen to the altitude of "writing brevier." To say that I have been in and of nearly a generation of American newspaper life would be less than the truth, for I agree with a philosophic fellow-worker who fixed the term of a generation of newspaper men at thirteen years. They do come and go with wonderful rapidity, and some of us who are already in the third cycle of change feel like apologizing either for our perverse inability to die, or for our incapacity to find some more profitable sphere of effort. I felt this way the other day, when (in my hearing) a successful physician, who began life as a reporter, spoke very scornfully of the newspaper man who had not sense enough to discover that the talents needed to earn him a bare living in "journalism" would bring him substantial rewards in any other business or profession. I suppose it must have been some such idea that was at the root of Horace Greeley's fixed objection to paying any man a salary of more than twenty-five dollars a week; it being his opinion that if an employee of a newspaper could earn more than that he ought to strike out for himself. Considering the number of second- and third-rate newspaper men who have made first-class reputations in politics, have adorned Presidential cabinets, and made their mark generally in the public life of the country, there does seem to be something wrong with the old hands at the bellows who can find nothing better to do.

I am not a panegyrist of the past at the expense of the present in newspaper-making or anything else, but the fact cannot well be ignored that on the daily press of 1895 the qualities that are acquired by training and experience count for less than they did even twenty years ago. A mature and reasonably accurate knowledge of public men and affairs has not ceased to be useful in newspaper offices, but it has ceased—even when accompanied by a talent for vigorous writing—to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be the most lasting kind of journalistic capital. That is significant of other things besides the change that has come over the spirit of the press, for, in truth, the conductors of newspapers have merely changed the character of their wares to suit their public. A man may aspire to the highest position that a newspaper offers in these days without knowing anything about the principles contended for by John C. Calhoun, and without being ashamed of his ignorance concerning the division of parties at the Presidential election of 1844. The few who want to know anything about Nullification or Abolition turn to books, not to newspapers. Such words stand for controversies whose fires are spent at last, and for movements whose work is done. But none of the newer controversies has had the power to stir men's souls like these; and, since 1877, nobody save some casual crank has dared to interject into public discussion an issue involving the tremendous possibility of civil war. If newspapers do less to mould public opinion than they used to do, it is probably because the political questions of our day are such that most people feel capable of judging their merits for themselves.

At a dinner of the New York Press Club, some fifteen years ago, I listened to the grandiloquent statement that there is no newspaper in the country which is deliberately written down to the moral and intellectual level of the lowest class of its actual or possible purchasers. There are a number of good people who think that here in New York at least we have changed all that. I must be permitted to doubt the existence of any radical change in this respect: if the statement was true in 1880, it is true to-day. But I confess to a rooted scepticism about the sense of moral responsibility that goes to the making of newspapers. I have known of quixotic sacrifices being made in newspaper management for what is called "principle," but in my own experience the only uniform rule of conduct for an editor was to avoid libellous matter and keep the standard of decency at about the level presumed to be that demanded by the average reader. It does seem as if the average man—and woman, too—can stand more in the way of salacious reporting than they used to do. The erotic problems explored in literature, and spread out at large with extreme frankness in widely-circulated novels, indicate a breaking-down of the moral censorship to which newspapers had to conform a quarter of a century ago. The one coherent theory of newspaper management is to make the kind of sheet that sells best. Now that the momentous issues which shook and nearly shattered the younger Republic are out of the way, and the issues that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may shake it again have not yet taken hold on the minds of the multitude, the great editor is the man who can cater most successfully to the desire of the many-headed public to be startled, excited, or amused by his manner of presenting the daily happenings of a world that can always produce a fair average of notable phases of wickedness and folly.

Most of the great editors who left their mark on the last generation were able and powerful pamphleteers: in some cases very little more. There are interesting survivals of this type with us yet; but the successful editors who are the characteristic product of our time are merely capable police reporters with a larger field. This species has been evolved in harmony with the familiar law of correspondence between the hour and the man. With it has also come what is to the old stagers in the business the most peculiar of contemporary newspaper phenomena—the dictatorial attitude of the publication office. That the new editor could be but half a success without a resourceful publisher, needs but a little reflection to make plain. I think we stood at the dividing of the ways some thirteen years ago. About that time the New York newspaper that could boast most securely of its circulation was the one to whose contents the great art of condensation was most vigorously and intelligently applied. It was accepted as the model of a daily journal for busy men. It dictated its own terms to the advertiser, the volume of whose announcements it kept in strict subjection to the demands of its reading-space, and with whose support indeed it was one of its boasts that it could easily dispense, making a clear and sufficient profit on circulation alone. It seemed for a while that this was to become the dominating type of the successful American newspaper. But just then there came to New York a very clever man who had made up his mind to create a successful newspaper on totally different lines. The kind of matter that was daily served up under his direction was contemptuously designated in the newspaper world as "swash," "flapdoodle," and other things of like import, and a very brief career was prophesied for this alleged libel on metropolitan intelligence. But it shortly appeared that the thing had "come to stay." From the very first, almost, the experiment was conducted amid what somebody called a perfect chaos of success, and on it were laid with amazing rapidity the foundations of a fortune.

When newspaper men began to ask themselves why a brilliant success should have been achieved in the teeth of all their conceptions of what a newspaper ought to be, several explanations were forthcoming. The most obvious was that we had all been overrating the intelligence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our public,—writing over their heads, so to speak,—and that this man had merely profited by a fact known aforetime to philosophers and quack-medicine vendors, that people are mostly fools. Then there were the pictures,—very bad pictures it is true,—but still affording the kind of aid to rudimentary intelligence that suggested to Richard Henry Stoddard the idea that the new journalism should be called the illustrated-alphabet style. To convey to the infant mind the significance of the symbol called "A," it is usual to say that "*A* was an Archer who shot at a frog," and to remove all doubt about the identity of the parties to this transaction there is presented a picture of the archer and another of the frog. But New York had known sensationalism—even vapid sensationalism—in its newspapers before, and remarkable outbreaks of pictorial art had from time to time been seen on the face of the established sheets that were most scornful of the new departure. The peculiarity of this proved to be that it was no mere passing ebullition of extravagance, more or less consciously feigned to attract notice and to promote circulation. It was a deliberately chosen and consistently pursued method of making a newspaper interesting and readable, and greater even than its success with the public has been its success in compelling the imitation of those who most disliked and despised it. If the accepted explanation of this success be true, if it were merely a demonstration of the fact that the great public of the East Side had for the first time been supplied with a newspaper on a level with their intelligence, one wonders why journals in New York and elsewhere, appealing to quite a different class of readers, should be carried away by its influence. If the cynics are right in claiming that there is not a great difference between the moral and intellectual elevation of Murray Hill and that of Avenue B, the phenomenon becomes less puzzling.

It will hardly be denied that the success of the new method of newspaper-making was greatly aided by a conspicuous political blunder opportunely made by one great daily journal and an equally notable business blunder made by another. Knowing something of the personal reasons that actuated the first, I am often tempted to wonder whether the ideal type of a condensed newspaper might have survived, vigorous and alert, to dispute the suffrages of the people with the many-sheeted and diffuse media of small-beer chronicles, if a great public man had not forgotten to send a great editor a promised invitation to dinner. From the earliest emergence of the great man, the two had been mutually antipathetic, and slights and wrongs, real or fancied,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had widened the breach. But a common friend, a man of tact and resource, had succeeded in extorting from the editor a promise to go to that dinner, which, alas! owing to the unforgivable preoccupation of the great man with what he mistakenly imagined to be great affairs, was never eaten. Hence, not as a matter of logical sequence, but of mere human "cussedness," the great editor plunged his paper in the mire of a paltry and despicable "ism" when it should have been in the front of one of the great political contests of our history. The new man was there, and had his reward, though it happens that he does not think so, being impressed with the idea that he was the controlling force in the outcome of the struggle, and being correspondingly chagrined by the failure of its chief beneficiary to recognize that fact. The new man has, however, been content to take it out in nagging, chiefly in "off years," when nobody minded it. The specialty of the other being in the deadlier art of stabbing, a more serious situation was created, and newspaper condensation was allowed to become a lost art because a great editor, a ripe scholar, and a gentleman of unimpeachably fine taste thought he could combine the luxury of "getting even" with that of making a popular and profitable newspaper.

The connection of ideas is perhaps not quite obvious, so that it should be explained that it is frequently impossible for an editor to use his paper for the satisfaction of personal grudges and hold his readers at the same time. This happened to be a case in point, and the new style of newspaper got so good a start that its contemporaries fell with one accord to imitating it. From all of which it may be conjectured that the disposition to "get even" with adversaries is one of the most dangerous failings of an editor. There was a time when newspaper men in New York and Washington contributed not a little to public entertainment by the savage way in which they pitched into each other. That doughty combatant, James Watson Webb, was grand master in this kind of strife. Back in the 'thirties, the liability to be challenged tempered, but did not restrain, the virulence of newspaper abuse, and it flourished unchecked in the early days of the New York "Herald," when the entire press of the city combined to put down this daring and successful aspirant for public favor. In Hudson's "History of Journalism in the United States" may be found a collection of the choice epithets hurled at the elder Bennett in 1840 by Park Benjamin, in the "Signal"; by Judge Noah in the "Evening Star"; and by James Watson Webb in the "Courier and Enquirer." These have not been surpassed before or since. Beside them, Greeley's "little villain"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characterization of Raymond in 1853 and after, sounds tame. The last eminent professor of the cut-and-thrust method of dealing with his brethren of the press was Jennings of the "Times." He found, I think, a genuine delight in it, and one of the pastimes of the New York editors of twenty-five years ago was to goad this redoubtable swash-buckler into paragraphic fury. He gave, as a rule, as good as he got. But it may be doubted whether his animadversions on the table manners and the condition of the finger-nails of the editor of an evening contemporary had precisely the effect intended. The victim was not sensitive to that kind of criticism, and it made discriminating readers grieve. There was another editor, however, who could always be stirred up by a reference to a rejected application of his for public office, and still another who did not like repeated allusions to his weakness for borrowing and not returning the wearing-apparel and other personal effects of his friends. In justice to the assailant it must be said that he became the target of attack mainly because he had undertaken the work of reforming the city government of New York, an enterprise which did not then command the general newspaper approval which it does now. The people who were then robbing the municipal treasury had "squared" the newspapers pretty successfully. They dispensed a corruption fund of over a million dollars in payments for city and county advertising, and report had it that the city pay-rolls yielded monthly salaries for some of the managing editors and other newspaper men presumed to be worth buying. It was but natural that the "Times" editor, when he began his assault on the men who governed New York in 1870, stirred up a veritable hornets' nest.

I imagine that the brilliant success of those attacks on the Tweed Ring has had something to do with the newspaper tendency which has developed so strongly in the last twenty-five years,—that, namely, of finding something to expose. I do not know of any success quite so legitimate in this line as that of the "Times." It required more courage than most of the many newspaper efforts to lay bare corruption or redress wrong that have succeeded it. The actuating motives of that paper's crusade against the Ring rule of 1870–71, I take to have been complex. There was, I believe, for one thing, a large bill for city advertising that stood unpaid, and there was, of course, the effort to make an impression and get the paper out of the somewhat commonplace rut into which it had been allowed to settle. But the risk was tremendous. The Tweed *régime* was the result of a general consensus of opinion that it was better to put the conduct of city affairs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the hands of a few men than to leave the responsibility for misgovernment among supervisors, aldermen, and members of the legislature. Nobody believed in the honesty of the "boss," but it was assumed by men who ought to have known better that he had already got enough, and that he might be trusted to embrace the chance to make a record for himself. In any case, the Democratic factions that had made war on him were headed by men not more reputable, and presumably more hungry. So the consolidation of power was effected,—with some audible protest it is true, but without much public dissatisfaction. The result was a despotism more nearly complete and more absolutely unscrupulous than anything known in municipal history. The "Ring" owned judges, and the prosecuting officers were its creatures. A newspaper pitting itself against such a combination risked more than the odium of failure; it put at hazard all it was worth. The timidity of capital played a great part in giving Tweed a secure hold on the city treasury. The Astor-Taylor-Roberts report on the "correctness" of Comptroller Connolly's accounts was a sample of the services which the rich men of New York rendered to the city at one of the most critical periods of its history. I do not know when the "Times" came into possession of the figures from Connolly's books copied by the retainers of ex-Sheriff O'Brien—a man who had also the grievance of an unpaid claim; but I do know that some of them at least were hawked about the newspaper offices and were rejected as familiar stuff concerning the frauds of the old Board of Supervisors. They did the business for the Ring, and made a most effective climax for the nine or ten months of incessant attack that had preceded them. But I doubt if they would have had their full effect save for the uphill fight that went before, for whose courage and persistency it has never appeared to me that the proprietors of the "Times," who took the real risk, received all the credit they deserved.

This was a signal evidence of what a newspaper, almost unaided, could accomplish in virtue of its command of publicity, and I take it that all the fine things that are said about the power of a free press resolve themselves into this simple advantage. You may placard every dead wall in New York with a startling announcement, and get less effect from it than by its publication in a widely-circulated newspaper. It may be that editors err in flattering themselves that publication in the daily journal has also a moral effect vastly superior to that of publication by placard. There is, however, such a thing as character in the influence of a newspaper, though, whether it be that there is less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character or less public belief in its existence than there used to be, it counts for surprisingly little in these days. A Chicago man once said to me, after the election of a very objectionable candidate for public office in that city in spite of the almost united opposition of the press: "You newspaper people make a great mistake in supposing that the public take you at your own valuation. I know a good deal about the way you conduct your business, and I think it is done on a pretty low level. You cannot get me or any other business man to believe in the high moral sentiments of your editorial columns while they are so foreign to the practice of your counting-room." Everybody is not so well informed, and the methods of Chicago may be exceptional; but nobody seems to take the newspapers quite so seriously as they take themselves. It was not thus in the days when Greeley made the "Tribune" a political gospel for thousands of sincere, simple-minded folk in these United States; but the many-sided and feverishly enterprising journalism of our time has this among other drawbacks,—that its honesty is often doubted, and its disinterestedness is always in question.

This is no doubt due in part to the general public knowledge of the existence of that most objectionable practice of inserting advertisements disguised as news. There are newspapers that keep a special bureau of their advertising department devoted to "write-ups," and who are not above using the club of threatened attack to compel the payment of so much per column for complimentary reading-matter. Between this depth of degradation and the ordinary practice of reputable newspapers there is, of course, a wide interval. But few of them are as strict as they once were about making a clear distinction between reading-matter and advertising, and there is a class of notices admitted by some of the richest and most powerful of them into their columns that is an outrage on public decency. This sort of thing does not cohere with the "bow-wow" style of moral suasion much affected by writers of "brevier," and some caustic wits find in the contrast one of the most comical features of daily journalism. There are public men who smart under newspaper attack, to whose outraged sense of justice the contrast between newspaper profession and newspaper practice only adds new indignation. It is hardly to be expected that any man should recognize his own likeness as depicted in the columns of an unfriendly newspaper, but some of the victims of journalistic hounding are wont to declare that no such person as they are described to be could possibly exist. There is, in truth, a certain carelessness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the finer shades of portraiture when it is a question of holding up somebody to public reprobation. From the necessities of their position, men in newspaper offices who do the heavy business of passing judgment on the servants or masters of the people know, as a rule, very little about their individual personality. It is thus that the combination of offensive qualities which passes in a newspaper office for some public character resembles the original as much as *Quilp's* wooden figure-head resembled the gentle *Kit*. But it answers a similar purpose, though it must be said that, unlike the vindictive dwarf, the newspaper man brings very little malice to the screwing of gimlets and the sticking of forks into his effigy. It is, very largely, a perfunctory process, like turning off some suitable reflections for Thanksgiving, or lamenting the decadence of political morals in an article for Washington's Birthday. Of course, the individual whose name the effigy happens to bear does not like it, any more than he would like the playful attention of being burned in the person of a dummy; and a good deal of bad blood is thus engendered between two divisions of the body politic that ought to be better acquainted with each other.

I cannot imagine a man looking back over a lifetime spent in the work of newspaper offices with any sentiment more cheerful than that of a humorous sadness. Whatever may have been the measure of his success, he must recall the ideals with which he began his career with a sense of wonder as to whether it was really he who cherished them. Perhaps the same thing may be said of most other kinds of human careers, but I know of none in which there is so violent a contrast between the professed nobility of aim and the unblushing meanness of method. It is the fashion to call journalism a profession, but it is subject to none of the conditions which would entitle it to the name. There are no recognized rules of conduct for its members, and no tribunal to enforce them, if there were. The most despicable of men may, without challenge, call themselves "journalists," no less than the most worthy. There is no more exacting and exhausting work than that which constitutes the daily routine of a newspaper office. It grinds the youth out of a man with great rapidity, and in stealing his physical elasticity robs him also of certain finer impulses that are harder to recover. And yet it has a charm of its own to which the most wearied of its bondsmen never become quite insensible. To a young man fresh from college, possessing the knack of composition and not troubled with literary fastidiousness, it seems the ideal career. As a newspaper man he can become a personage in a wonderfully

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

short space of time, and can at a bound attain what seems to him the secure independence of $25 a week. He may be making twice this amount and be known to most of the men about town before his classmate who went into the law is earning enough to pay his board-bills, or the one who took to medicine has ceased to be a charge on his parents. But as the years roll by he begins to discern the difference between an established reputation and one that has to be made afresh every day. Work, untiring and ceaseless, is the badge of all professions, but the work of the newspaper man at forty-five is not necessarily better paid work than that of the same man at twenty-five. Twenty years of what is called successful devotion to his calling has probably brought him a sense of security in his ability to earn his living, and a consequent indifference to the incessant changes of the little world which bounds his sphere of activity, but beyond that sense of personal independence he has gained but little. Whether or no he be a writer "on space," he must turn out a certain amount of copy or its equivalent for at least fifty weeks in the year, and the fame of what he did last week is as dead as the fame of what he did ten years ago. For failing mental vigor there is no place in a newspaper office; for long service no retiring pension. The man who cannot keep step with the procession is thrust aside or walked over. The law of the survival of the fittest reigns here in all its brutal vigor; but what may be the enduring type of work or worker, to which all the stress and struggle of the men who make the daily press are converging, is beyond the reach of my conjecture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED